SHOUT
SHARE
IT

U6X
no.44
c.2
SOA

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY
BULLETIN 44

INDIAN LANGUAGES OF MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA

AND THEIR GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

BY
CYRUS THOMAS
ASSISTED BY
JOHN R. SWANTON

ACCOMPANIED WITH A LINGUISTIC MAP

SMITHSONIAN
OCT 29 1942
LIBRARIES

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1911

SMITHSONIAN LIBRARY
BUR. OF AMER. ETHNOLOGY

PREFATORY NOTE

About the year 1895 Maj. J. W. Powell, Director of the Bureau of American Ethnology, determined on the preparation of a linguistic map of that part of North America south of the Mexican boundary, having in view the extension southward of the classification and mapping of the linguistic families north of that border. Dr. Cyrus Thomas was assigned the task of assembling the preliminary data and the preparation of a sketch map, but the death of Major Powell before the research had assumed final shape, and the assignment to Doctor Thomas of more urgent work, necessitated delay in the completion until the latter part of 1908. At that time Dr. J. R. Swanton, who had entered on a study of the languages of the tribes of the lower Mississippi valley and the Gulf coast, became interested in the linguistic classification of the tribes of middle America, and on the joint suggestion of Doctors Thomas and Swanton copies of the map were prepared and submitted to a number of students who had devoted attention to the languages and ethnology of Mexico and Central America, soliciting criticism and making inquiry respecting the advisability of publication at this stage. The following anthropologists responded, furnishing valuable data: Dr. Carl Sapper, Dr. A. L. Kroeber, Dr. Frederick Starr, Dr. Nicolás León, Dr. H. Pittier de Fábrega, Dr. A. M. Tozzer, Señor Francisco Belmar, Dr. Aleš Hrdlička, and Dr. Franz Boas. Corrections and additions were made in accordance with some of the suggestions offered, bringing the classification and the map as nearly to date as possible. These results are now submitted, not as a final work, but as an attempt to represent the present state of knowledge regarding a subject which may never be cleared entirely of obscurity.

W. H. Holmes, *Chief.*

June 2, 1909.

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Mexico	2
Cocopa	2
Cochimi	3
Waïcuri and Pericu	4
Pima	7
Opata	7
Tarahumare	8
Seri	10
The Yaqui group	11
Zoe and Tepahue	17
Tepehuane	19
Acaxee	19
Cora	21
Huichol	22
Tepecano, Teule, Cazcan, and Tecuexe	23
Names of tribes in northwestern Mexico not considered separately	24
Concho	36
Toboso	37
Pakawan	38
Laguneros	38
Zacateco	40
Guachichile	40
The term Chichimeca	41
Tamaulipeco	44
Pisone and Janambre	44
Olive	44
Names of tribes in northeastern Mexico not considered separately	45
Otomi	46
Pame	46
Mazahua	47
Pirinda	48
Meco	48
Huasteca	48
Totonac	49
Tepehua	49
Meztitlaneca	50
Tlascalan	50
Cuitlateco	50
Tarasco	51
Aztec	51
Mixtec	52
Trike	52
Chocho	53

Mexico—Continued. Page
Amishgo 54
Chatino 54
Mazateco 54
Cuicateco 55
Chinantec 55
Zapotec 55
The Mixtec and Zapotec languages compared 56
Chontal 58
Huave 59
Mixe 60
Zoque 60
Central America 61
Chiapanec 61
Chontal (of Tabasco) 61
Tzotzil 62
Tzental 62
Chol 63
Chañabal 64
Chicomucelteca 65
Motozintleca 65
Tapachulteca 65
Subinha 65
Jacalteca 65
Chuje 66
Achis 66
Mam 66
Ixil 67
Aguacateca 67
Kiche 67
Cakchikel 67
Tzutuhil 68
Uspanteca 68
Kekchi 68
Pokonchi 69
Pokomam 69
Chorti 69
Maya proper 70
Maya dialects 70
Alaguilac 72
Pipil 72
Xinca 73
Lenca 73
Tlascalteca 74
Jicaque 75
Paya 75
Carib 76
Matagalpa 76
Mangue 76
Subtiaban 77
Dirian 77
Niquiran 78
Orotinan 78
Ulva 78

Central America—Continued. Page
Rama ... 80
Mosquito ... 80
General remarks on the tribes of Costa Rica ... 81
Guatuso ... 84
Guetare ... 85
Voto ... 87
Suerre (?) ... 87
Quepo (?) ... 88
Talamanca ... 88
Sigua ... 92
Doraskean tribes ... 93
Guaymie ... 94
Cuna ... 95
Ethnic dividing line between North and South America ... 96
Bibliography ... 97
Index of linguistic families, tribes, and settlements ... 101

ILLUSTRATION

Linguistic map of Mexico and Central America ... at end

INDIAN LANGUAGES OF MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA

By Cyrus Thomas
Assisted by John R. Swanton

INTRODUCTION

The narrative portion of this bulletin is devoted to a statement of the authority on which the establishment of the linguistic areas indicated on the accompanying map rests, along with the writer's reasons for adopting certain names and rejecting others. For Mexico, Orozco y Berra's map and conclusions are used as a basis, and it will be found, though the original authorities, so far as accessible, have been examined, that there has been occasion for but few and comparatively slight changes. This authority was not only familiar with all of the works, early and late, bearing on this subject that had been published up to his time, but he also had access to numerous unpublished documents.

As these notes will show, there are some other linguistic names which, in view of the evidence, are entitled perhaps to places on the map, but it has been considered best to omit them wherever much doubt exists. It has been found impossible, and perhaps it will always remain so, to indicate the smaller linguistic areas within the major stocks in conformity with any absolute standard. The Mayan, Zapotecan, Zoquean, and part of the Nahuatlan stocks are the only ones which could be satisfactorily treated in this manner, but it must be remembered that many others would be found to have similar subdivisions were data available. Where relationship is suspected between two or more stocks an endeavor has been made to indicate the fact by using related shades of coloring. All tribes treated in the text will not be found indicated on the map, in some cases because the languages spoken by them did not differ sufficiently from those of their neighbors to warrant independent representation, and in others because they occupied "unclassified" areas. As mentioned in the prefatory note, the map accompanying this bulletin has been submitted to a number of students familiar with Mexican ethnology, and several alterations and additions suggested by them have been adopted.

C. T.

MEXICO

COCOPA

(*Synonym:* Cucapa)

The Indians speaking this idiom are generally placed in the Yuman family, and, according to Orozco y Berra, are sometimes referred to by the names Cuhanes, Cuanes, and Yuanes. The name given on his map is Cuhanes. Unfortunately, however, he has made two tribes of them, one (Cucapas, or Cuhanes) which he places in the Yuman family; the other (Cocopas) in the Piman family. Doctor Gatschet (415)[1] makes the two names synonyms and places the one tribe in the Yuman family. However, the relations of the tribe have not yet been satisfactorily worked out. These Indians live along the Colorado river near its mouth.

COCHIMI

The Cochimi were a division of the Yuman family living in the northern portions of the Californian peninsula. Their territory extended from the international boundary southward to, or a little beyond, the twenty-sixth parallel of north latitude, including Loreto, where it was bounded by the territory of the Waïcuri (Bancroft, I, 557). Orozco y Berra says (1:366): "Los Cochimíes ocupaban la península desde Loreto hasta poco mas allá de nuestra frontera." Venegas (I, 66) says: "Desde el territorio de Loreto, por todo lo descubierto al Norte de la nacion Cochimi;" Clavigero (22) says from 25° to 33° north latitude.

The Cochimi spoke a distinct language of the Yuman stock, divided, however, into from two to four dialects. Orozco y Berra, in his text (1: 366–367), mentions three, Cochimi del Norte, Edu, and Didu, but on his map he adds what seems to be a fourth, Cochimi (proper). He is evidently in error in referring to the Edu and Didu here, since they were Waïcurian and were situated considerably farther south. The northern Cochimi are mentioned by some authors as the Laymon. Prichard (II, 553) mentions "The Cochimi, Pericu, and Loretto languages; the former is the same as the Laymon, for the Laymones are the northern Cochimies." Hassel (57) mentions Laymon as distinct, and the Cochimi with three distinct dialects—San Francisco Borgia, Utschiti, and Ika. Bancroft (III, 687) mentions but two dialects of the Cochimi in his text—Laymon and Ika. It is questionable, however, whether the Ika were not Waïcurian.

In spite of Orozco y Berra's error in placing the Didu and Edu, the territory assigned by him to the Yuman stock agrees with the information of our best early authorities, and he has been followed in the accompanying map.

---

[1] See the Bibliography, pages 97–100.

Waïcuri and Pericu

It is usually stated that three principal languages were spoken in Lower California—Cochimi, which constituted a dialect of the Yuman family and has already been treated, Waïcuri, and Pericu. Could the authorities for this statement be sifted down in every case, it would probably be found that most of them derived their information from Venegas, who quotes a missionary named Taraval. In the same chapter Venegas admits that other missionaries increased the number to four or five, and gives one to understand that the more intimate a person became with the people the fewer linguistic divisions he found to exist. That Cochimi and the languages to the south of it were entirely distinct is known on linguistic evidence. The short vocabulary of Bägert is nearly all that is now available of the languages at the lower end of the peninsula, and Brinton attempted to find resemblances between this and Yuman, but the futility of his attempt has been demonstrated by Mr. J. N. B. Hewitt, and there can be no question of the independent position of the two languages. Regarding Pericu, the case is different, because, so far as known, there is not a word of that language, except some proper names, in existence, the only sources of information being the statements of early writers and circumstantial evidence. As already noted, the majority of direct statements make this people independent of the Waïcuri, but it is questionable how many independent original sources are represented. On the other hand, two authorities mention but two stock languages in the entire peninsula, one of which is, of course, Yuman, while the other includes all of the languages to the south of it. Again, if Pericu were really distinct from all others, why are so many mistakes made in applying the term? Although the Cora who occupied the eastern side of the peninsula at its lower end are frequently spoken of as a Waïcuri tribe, Venegas states that they were Pericu, and among later writers Orozco y Berra does not hesitate to include them in his Pericu area. Again, although Venegas gives the Utciti as a branch of the Waïcuri in his chapter on languages, in his second volume he mentions them as a Pericu tribe. Thirdly, although linguistic evidence can not be brought to bear satisfactorily, there is in the word Pericu itself and in a number of personal and mythological names from that tongue, proof of the existence of the phonetic *r*, which is also present in Waïcuri, but conspicuously absent from Cochimi. Altogether it seems best to regard Pericu as related to Waïcuri, only more distantly than any other of the group of southern dialects. As indicated on the map, the name appears to have been confined properly to one tribe about the mission of San José, near Cape St. Lucas, and extending northward on the west coast of Lower California to about 23° 30′.

PIMA

The Pima are scattered, as shown by the map, in five isolated groups, as follows:

Pima Alto (Upper Pima).
Pima Bajo (Lower Pima).
Potlapigua.
Pima of Bamoa.
Tepehuane colony.

Pima Alto.—As the Indians of this group are confined chiefly to the United States and are referred to in the Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, and as the area is marked on the linguistic map accompanying that Report, it is unnecessary to discuss them here.

Pima Bajo.—The Lower Pima extended east and west along the lower middle portion of the Yaqui river, joining the Tarahumare on the east, the Opata on the north, the Yaqui on the south, and the Seri on the west. These are substantially the boundaries given by Orozco y Berra, and are based chiefly on the position of villages in which the Piman language was spoken. However, the evidence in regard to the narrow strip extending along the south bank of the San José river to the Gulf, as shown on the map, is not entirely satisfactory. It is also possible that the eastern boundary has been carried a short distance into the Tarahumare territory.

Father Ribas (370) mentions as pueblos of the Lower Pima: Comoripa, Tecoripa, Zuaque (Suaque), and Aivino. The last two determine the extreme northern boundary as given by Orozco y Berra, while the first was located on the Yaqui river not far from the southern boundary. His statement (358) that the pueblos of the Movas, Onavas, and Nuri belonged to the Upper Pima must be a misprint or a clerical error, as they were certainly situated in the territory of the Pima Bajo, and he must have known this; however, there is further mention of this point below. The situation of the Nuri pueblo determines the extreme southern point of the area in the map, and Nocori the northwestern extension. However, the pueblos of Yepachic and Tonachic in the eastern part of the territory, as laid down by Orozco y Berra, appear, from the termination of the names, to be of Tarahumare origin, and this supposition seems to be confirmed by the statement of Juan Ortiz Zapata (340) that these two pueblos were included among the Tarahumare missions. A slight change from Orozco y Berra's eastern boundary line has therefore been made to correspond with this evidence. Though the Pima language may possibly have been spoken at these two missions, the names betray the fact that the pueblos were originally Tarahumare.

Potlapigua.—An isolated group of Pima, named Potlapigua, is mentioned by Orozco y Berra (1:348) in the region of Babispe, on the

northeastern boundary of the Opata territory, though not marked on his map. They are located by Hamy[1] on his map, however, and are noted on the map accompanying this paper, though numbered 3 by mistake. That this separation from the main body dates back to the period herein referred to seems to be proven by the fact that Ribas (359) mentions the "Bapispes" as in the direction of New Mexico from Sinaloa.

Pima of Bamoa.—Another isolated group was situated south of the Mayo on lower Sinaloa river, Bamoa being the chief pueblo. This group, which is properly marked on Orozco y Berra's map (under the name Bamoa), consisted, chiefly at least, of the Pima who accompanied Cabeza de Vaca on his return from Florida (Ribas, 119; Orozco y Berra, **1**: 333). The former says expressly that these accompanying Indians were Nebomes (Pima) and that they settled the pueblo of Bamoa on the Rio de Petatlan (Sinaloa river). They do not appear to have spoken a language dialectically different from Lower Pima, hence the name Bamoa is omitted from our map.

Tepehuane colony.—Hamy locates another small group, without any special name, in the extreme western portion of the Tepehuane territory. This is based probably on the statement by Orozco y Berra (**1**: 324) that some documents say that the villages of this section were inhabited by Pima, and others, that they were peopled by Tepehuane. He adds the belief that they were chiefly Pima.

Mention is made of several supposed subtribes of the Lower Pima, as the Movas, Comuripa, Aibino, Onavas, and Nuri; but these names appear to refer chiefly to different villages without sufficient evidence of difference in dialect. Orozco y Berra (**1**: 353) says the Movas, Onavas, Nuri, Comuripa, and Tecoripa were pueblos of the Lower Pima in which the Pima language was spoken, but that the Aibino and Sisibotari were subtribes of the Upper Pima (an evident error, as Aibino was a Lower Pima pueblo); Hamy places the Aibino, Comuripa, Onavas, Movas, and Nuri on his map as subtribes of the Lower Pima. (See remarks below.)

Doctor Brinton asserts (**3**: 127) that the Ahome were "a distinctly Pima people," referring to Buelna as authority.[2] This is probably an error, as the dialect spoken by this people appears to have been substantially the same as that spoken by the Guazave, who pertained to the Yaqui group (Yaqui, Mayo, Tehueco), as will appear in the notes relating to that tribe.

Although the Guayma have generally been considered a subtribe of the Seri, Hervas appears to dissent from this view, and comparatively recently Pinart, from an examination of a remnant of the group, is inclined to connect them with the Pima (Brinton, **3**: 127).

[1] Bull. Soc. d'anthrop. de Paris, 3. s., VI, 785–791, Nov., 1883, and Decades Americanæ 3d and 4th, 99. See also Doc. Hist. Mex., 4th ser., I, 401.

[2] Peregrinacion de los Aztecas y Nombres Geográficos Indígenas de Sinaloa, p. 21, Mexico, 1887.

Further examination of this point will be found in the notes relating to the Seri.

Reference to the supposed tribes or subtribes Aibino (or Aivino), Movas (or Mobas), Comuripa (or Comoripa), Onavas (or Onabas), Tecoripa, and Nuri is again made in order to give briefly the reasons for omitting them from the map. As stated above, they are considered by Orozco y Berra as merely pueblos in which the Pima language was spoken without such dialectic differences as to justify considering them distinct. As a rule, all dialects referred to by early authors writing of this section are spoken of as "distinct" or "particular" languages, though the writers recognized their affinities.

In regard to the Onava and Tecoripa, it seems to be fairly inferred from the statements by Cancio (155–156) that they spoke the Piman language. This agrees with the statement by Zapata (358–361) that the language spoken at Tecoripa, Cumuripa, and Onava was Pima, and that at Mova the language was partly Pima and partly Egue (Eudeve), and hence not distinct. Velarde (399) calls the Indians of Tecoripa, and also the Aibino, Pima. Ribas (370) includes the pueblos Comoripa, Tecoripa, and Aibino among those of the Lower Pima.

The last-named author (299, 358) speaks of the Nuri as Nebome (Pima) and on the latter page connects them with the Upper Pima, but on page 369 says they are a nation of a language different from that of the Upper Pima, though not very distant from them. However, according to Orozco y Berra (**1**:351) they inhabited the pueblo of Nuri, which was certainly Lower Pima. It seems from Ribas (lib. VI, cap. VI) that the Nuri he refers to as belonging to or adjoining the Upper Pima were a different people from those occupying the Nuri pueblo.

Although Hamy places these names (except Tecoripa) on his map heretofore referred to, and notwithstanding the fact that they are spoken of as "naciones," there is not sufficient evidence to warrant the conclusion that they spoke distinct dialects. Ribas (373–374), speaking of the Aivino and other pueblos of that immediate section (en toda esta tierra adētro), says two languages were current throughout, and that Padre Oliñano, who preached to them, understood well the two languages of these nations. However, he fails to state what languages these were. By turning to Zapata's Relación, heretofore referred to, some light on this point may be obtained. Speaking of the Mobas (361), he says their language, as mentioned above, was partly Pima and partly Egue (Eudeve), which so far agrees with Ribas's statement and indicates the two languages to which the latter refers.

Opata

(*Synonym:* Teguima)

The Opata lived chiefly about the headwaters of the Yaqui and Hermosillo rivers, the Apache being on the northeast, the Tarahumare on the southeast, the Lower Pima on the south, and the Seri on the west. There were two subtribes which spoke dialects of the mother language—the Eudeve (Heve or Dohema) and the Jova (Jobal or Ova). (Doc. Hist. Mex., 3d s., IV, 552–553.)

Orozco y Berra says (**1**:343–344) that according to D. Francisco Velasco the Opata "nacion" was subdivided into the Opatas Teguis, Opatas Teguimas, and Opatas Coguinachis. His quotation is not strictly exact, as Velasco, in the article referred to (**2**:705), gives as divisions Jovas, Següis (Teguis), Tegüimas, and Cogüinachis. But as the last three names do not appear to have had any linguistic signification, and are not otherwise referred to as those of subtribes, they may be dismissed from consideration.

The Eudeve (Heve, Dohme, or Dohema), forming the chief subtribe, inhabited the headwaters of the Rio Hermosillo. Their location is given in Orozco y Berra's work by pueblos in the region mentioned. The dialect of this subtribe shows considerable difference from that of the Opata proper (Pimentel, II, 153), but not sufficient to consider it otherwise than as a dialect. An anonymous author (Doc. Hist. Mex., 3d s., IV, 494, 534) even says the difference is not greater than that between Portuguese and Castilian, or between French and Provençal. Alegre (II, 216) seems also to have considered the dialects as not widely different.

The Jova (Jobal or Ova) formed another subtribe speaking a language dialectically different from Opata and Eudeve, though more closely related to the former than was Eudeve. Although the location of this subtribe seems to be pretty clearly indicated by the historical evidence as being in the eastern part of the Opata territory, as laid down in Orozco y Berra's map, Hamy, in his map heretofore referred to, locates them in the central portion of the Tarahumare territory as drawn by him and Orozco y Berra. This appears to be based on the statement of the latter author that one of the Jova pueblos was Santo Tomas, which he locates about the place where Hamy places the Jovas on his map. However, Orozco y Berra also names as Jova pueblos San José Teopari, Los Dolores, Sahuaripa, Ponida, Arivetzi, and San Mateo Malzura, all of which are in the southeastern part of the Opata territory as given in his map, which, as before indicated, Hamy has followed in marking the tribal boundaries.

If the Jova territory extended to and included Santo Tomas, then the Opata territory, if this pueblo is correctly laid down, should be extended more to the southeast than it is on Orozco y Berra's map.

This is doubtful, it being more likely that this pueblo was peopled chiefly by Indians speaking the Jova language, the other pueblos of that section being Tarahumare. Hervas (332) includes Santo Tomas among the pueblos or missions of the Chinipas, who, he says, spoke a dialect of Tarahumare, or, as will be shown farther on, was not distinct therefrom. His list, however, is dated 1767. As throwing some light on this point it is noticeable that Zapata (340–343) states that the mission at Tosonachic in the Tarahumare territory directly north of Santo Tomas, and Yepachic directly west of the latter on the border of the Pima Bajo territory, as given by Orozco y Berra, were Tarahumare missions. But that at Matachic, immediately south of Tosonachic (or Tesomachic), and between it and Santo Tomas and the region immediately around it, he speaks of as belonging to the Jova (or Ova), or at least places it under the heading "Nacion de los Ovas."

It would seem from these statements (in 1678) that the Opata boundary should be extended a little farther to the southeast than given by Orozco y Berra, yet the termination *chic* (Matachic) savors strongly of Tarahumare origin, and Matachic is included in the Tarahumare in the Handbook of American Indians. As will be seen below and by reference to our map, a small portion of the extreme eastern part of the Lower Pima territory, as given in Orozco y Berra's map, has been included in the Tarahumare area.

In regard to the Batuco, Cumupa, Buasdaba, and Bapiape, mentioned by some authorities as located within the Opata territory, see notes below respecting the list of names not given on the accompanying map.

Tarahumare

The Tarahumare inhabited the sierras, their area embracing parts of Chihuahua, Durango, and Sonora, the Apache being on the north, the Opata and Lower Pima on the west, the Tepehuane on the south, and the Concho on the east, and extending from about latitude 26° to 29° and longitude 106° to 108° W. Orozco y Berra (1:34) says, "Cuenta hasta cinco dialectos poco distantes de la lengua madre, *y los siguientes*, que se separan mas ó menos de su fuente." (The italics are the present author's.) Then he names the following four: Varohio, Guazápare, Pachera, and Tubar. What is to be understood by the "five dialects but little distant from the mother tongue," unless the four named are included, does not clearly appear from his work; at least it seems that he did not consider them sufficiently "distant" to regard them as distinct dialects, as he does not follow up the subject.

Hervas (332) states that the Tarahumara (the Tarahumare country) is divided into two provinces, called Tarahumara alta and Tarahu-

mara baja. To what extent this is to be considered as denoting dialectic differences can only be inferred from the statement which follows:

> En aquella se habla la lengua *chinipa*, de la que en el año 1767 los jesuitas tenian siete misiones, llamadas de *chinipas* y de la *Tarahumara-baxa*. La lengua *chinipa* parece ser dialecto de la *tarahumara*, que era la dominante en las misiones de los jesuitas en la Tarahumara-alta.

This statement seems to imply that Tarahumare proper was spoken in the upper district and Chinipa in the lower district. But as there appears to be some uncertainty and confusion on this point, it will be best to notice first the dialects mentioned above and then to return to the subject.

Orozco y Berra marks and colors separately on his map the Tubar, Guazipare, and Varohio areas, locating them along the southwestern boundary of the Tarahumare territory, where it meets the territory of the Yaqui group.

The earliest notice of the subtribe Tubar (Tubare or Tovare) is probably that by Ribas (117–118), from whom we learn that the group, which was not very numerous, dwelt in rancherias in the sierras about the headwaters of the Rio del Fuerte (Rio Cinaloa). He says the people spoke two languages totally distinct (*totalmente distintas*), but does not indicate their relationship. Hervas (320), commenting on the passage, says he infers from it that a portion of the Tubar subtribe spoke the "lengua propia" (meaning the Tarahumare or Chinipa) and the other part Tepehuane, which is probably the correct explanation. He (Hervas) identifies the Chinipa with those he terms the Lower Tarahumare. Orozco y Berra (**1:** 323–324), referring to a manuscript in possession of Ramirez, mentions Concepción, San Ignacio, and San Miguel as Tubar pueblos or pueblos in the Tubar region, and states that they were situated on one of the affluents of the Rio del Fuerte, adding that they spoke a particular idiom which was a dialect of the Tarahumare, distinct from the Varohio and Guazipare, and called the Tubar.

The earliest notice of the Varohio tribe or subtribe is also by Ribas (255), who mentions them in connection with Chinipa, Guazipare, Temori, and Ihio. He locates them in the sierras toward the north, between the Mayo and "Cinaloa" (Fuerte) rivers, which corresponds with the position given by Orozco y Berra on his map. Hervas (333) says they and the Guazipare were related linguistically to the Chinipa (Tarahumare). Zapata says (388–390) that Varohio and Guazipare are the same language, except that the latter is more nearly like Tarahumare. The same writer (333) connects the Pachera with the Tarahumare thus: "Á tres leguas de San José Temaichic está otro pueblo y mucha gente en él llamada taraumar Pachera." The termination *chic* of the name Temaichic indicates

Tarahumare origin. Moreover, the pueblo was evidently in Tarahumare territory, though there is no map at hand on which the name appears in this form.

Returning now to the Chinipa, the following facts should be noted: The name has evidently been used in different senses. Ribas (95–96) mentions them, but chiefly with reference to the distinction between them and the Sinaloa (Yaqui group), in the expression "uno de los pueblos de Chinipa," which indicates that he understood the name as including more than a single pueblo. At another place (255), speaking of "other nations which people the interior of the same sierra," he says: "They call these nations Chinipas, Guizipares, Temoris, Ihios, and Varohios."

Zapata (386–387) says that the Partido de Santa Inés de Chinipa lay 25 leagues east of San Andrés de Conicari, on the headwaters of the Rio del Fuerte. Alluding to the valley in which Chinipa was situated, he adds: "Que se compone de este de Chinipa y otro que se le junta y viene de los tubures gentiles." The language is not mentioned in this paragraph, but in the next, where Guadalupe of the Boragios (Varohios) is alluded to, it is stated that the language of this pueblo and of Santa Inés (Chinipa) is Varohio, and is recognized as the same as "Taura" (Tarahumare), varying somewhat "en la gramatica." The pueblo of Chinipa is located on Orozco y Berra's map in the Varohio territory, and in his classification (**1**:58, 326) he includes the people under Varohio as speaking that language. Alegre (II, 121) locates the Chinipa pueblos on the headwaters of the Rio del Fuerte, as does the preceding authority, but says they were joined for mission purposes with the Huites (which see, below). Again (174) he mentions them in the same relation as Ribas—"entre Chinipas, Guazaparis, Temoris y algunas otras naciones."

Villa-Señor y Sanchez (II, 399) speaks of Chinipa as a pueblo, the location being the same as that of Santa Inés Chinipa, above mentioned; and in another place (402) refers to the "Sierra de Chinipas."

One fact worthy of notice in this connection is that Padre Miguel Tellechea, author of Compendio Gramatical del Idioma Tarahumar (1826), was "ministro del Pueblo de Chinipas" and resided there a part, if not most, of the time his work was in course of preparation. Is this grammar based on the Varohio dialect or on the parent Tarahumare language? Had the distinctions and differences disappeared at the time he wrote? Chinipa is omitted from the map as not distinct from Varohio.

Seri

The territory of the Seri as laid down by Orozco y Berra extended along the coast of the Gulf of California from Guaymas, or rather the Rio San José, northward a little above 30° N., including the island of

Tiburon, and eastward to the territory of the Opata and the Lower Pima, being bounded on the north by the territory of the Upper Pima. Hamy's map, heretofore referred to, extends the northern boundary a little farther north than Orozco y Berra's. The evidence on which this northern boundary is based, however, is not definitely given by either of these authors. Orozco y Berra makes the brief statement (**1**: 354), "Los Salineros hácia los confines de la Pimeria alta," and states on the same page that the Salineros speak an idiom of Seri, but adds further, that in his classification he counts but "la principal" (the Seri proper) and the two dialects, Guayma and Upanguayma, showing that he does not consider Tiburon, Tepoca, and Salineros as varying sufficiently to be regarded as dialects.

Although the Guayma idiom has usually been considered a dialect of Seri and so designated by authors, Hervas has described it as distinct, and recently Pinart, from an examination made on the ground, concludes it is related to Pima. Hervas says (318) that in one of the missions of Yaqui river named Belen were Indians of three nations—the Yaqui, Seri, and Guayma—which used three different languages. José F. Ramirez, discussing this statement, presents reasons, given in the note below, for doubting its correctness, and shows such relations between the Guayma and the Lower Pima as may well explain the result obtained by Pinart,[1] but at the same time distinguishes Guayma from Pima. The linguistic position of Upanguayma, which is related to the latter, is of course determined by its position. José Gallardo (Bancroft, III, 704) says there is but little difference between Seri and Upanguayma.

The Yaqui Group

(*Synonyms:* Cahita, Cinaloa, Sinaloa)

The tribes of this group (often included under the name Cahita) were located chiefly along the middle and lower portions of the valleys of the Rio Yaqui, Rio Mayo, and Rio del Fuerte, extending

[1] "El abate *Hervas* dice (tomo I, página 318) que 'en la mision de Belen habia tres naciones que se llamaban *Hiaqui, Seri* y *Guaima*, que hablaban *tres lenguas diferentes.*' Esta última parte de su asercion presenta las siguientes dificultades. En el tomo XVI de los manuscritos del archivo general, hallará V. S. un papel que se intitula. 'Estado de la provincia de Sonora, con el catálogo de sus pueblos, iglesias etc. y Breve descripcion de la Sonora Jesuitica, segun se halla por el mes de Julio de este año de 1730 etc.' No tengo á la vista esta Memoria, mas por mis apuntes, debe ser en la parte donde el autor describe la mision del *Pópulo* en la que dice: 'que la lengua de los *Seris* es la misma de los *Guaimas.*' Ademas, en un informe que poseo del obispo de Sonora, dirigido á D. José de Galvez en 20 de Setiembre de 1784, dice el prelado, hablando de aquella mision de *Belen* 'viven unidas dos naciones de indios *Pimas bajos* y *Guaimas:* estos últimos desampararon su pueblo por los continuos asaltos de los *Seris*. Los *Pimas* usan su propio idioma. . . . Los *Guaimas* usan su antiguo idioma,' etc.

"Pasando ahora al exámen de estas noticias, y haciéndolo en el órden inverso de su esposicion, tendremos cómo primer hecho, probado con la respetable autoridad del Diocesano, la existencia de dos lenguas diversas en la mision de *Belem*, la de los *Guaimas* y la de los *Pimas bajos*. Sigue en órden la del misionero jesuita que dice, eran una misma la *Guaima* y la *Seri*. Parece, pues, que nada puede contrastar estos testimonios directos, y que en consecuencia hay una inexactitud en la asercion del abate Hervas que hace distintas la lengua *Seri* y *Guaima*. Aquella se esplica muy naturalmente con solo reflexionar que el sabio filólogo advierte, obtuvo su noticia de uno que decia haberla oido á un misionero."—*Bol. Soc. Geog. Estad. Mex.*, II, 149.

from the Gulf of California to the sierras. Their territory connected on the north with that of the Lower Pima and on the east with that of the Tarahumare. It seems that on the southeast, as early as the sixteenth century, they were in contact chiefly with people speaking a Nahuatl idiom.

But three dialects—Yaqui, Mayo, and Tehueco—are usually mentioned. Pimentel (I, 453) says of the group, "It is divided into three dialects, Yaqui, Mayo, and Tehueco." Buelna (x) limits them to the same three, and Balbi gives Zuaque, Mayo, and Yaqui. In his classified list Orozco y Berra (**1**: 58) names Yaqui, Mayo, Tehueco, and Vacoregue, and Brinton (**3**: 125) names the Tehueco, Zuaque, Mayo, and Yaqui as subtribes. Hervas (322) concludes from his study of Ribas's work that the following dialects were recognized: Yaqui (which he makes equivalent to Sinaloa), Zuaque, Mayo, Ocoroni, Tehueco, Conicari, Chicorata, Cavenata, Ahome, and Guazave. (As to Ocoroni, Conicari, Chicorata, and Ahome, see notes below.) Cavenata is merely the name of a pueblo given nowhere else as a dialect.

As there appears to be no difference of opinion in regard to Yaqui, Mayo, and Tehueco being dialects of the group, it will be necessary to refer only to the early historical evidence regarding localities.

As it has been suggested by Doctor Kroeber that the term Cahita is merely the native word meaning "nothing," and is therefore inappropriate as an ethnic designation, the name "Yaqui group" (from that of the best known tribe) has been adopted as more appropriate.

The Indians using the Yaqui dialect are almost universally located by our authorities on the Yaqui river; there are, however, some exceptions which will be referred to. The first notice of them is probably that in the Segunda Relación Anónima of the journey of Nuño de Guzman, between 1530 and 1540.[1] It is stated in this (II, 300–302) that after passing over the Rio de Tamachola, which appears to be the Fuerte (as Alegre, I, 231, implies), and traveling 30 leagues, they came to a river called Mayo on which lived a tribe ("gente") of the same "arte" and same language as those of the Sinaloa. Having passed on (northward), they came to another stream called Yaquimi, well peopled, "y los pueblos del arte de los de Cinaloa y de Mayon." The writer adds on the next page, "Desde el Rio de Petatlan hasta el de Yaquimi es todo una gente." That the Petatlan is the same river as that at present named Sinaloa is affirmed by Alegre (I, 231).

As there is some confusion in regard to the use of the names Sinaloa (or Cinaloa) and Zuaque as applied to tribes, and also some confusion in regard to the location of some of the tribes, it seems advisable first to give the evidence relating thereto. Hervas (323), quoting the following,

[1] In Colec. Doc. Hist. Mex.; see Icazbalceta in the Bibliography.

"El P. Christobal de Villalba [Villalta] (lib. 5, cap. 15, p. 324) sabia excelentemente la lengua de los *hiaquis*, y propia de los cinaloas," adds "por lo que lengua *hiaqui*, y lengua *cinaloa* es una misma cosa." On the preceding page (322) he also identifies the Cinaloa and Hiaqui (Yaqui) as one and the same— "Cinaloa ó Hiaqui." Now Ribas (284) locates the Hiaquis on the lower portion of the "Rio Hiaqui" (en las doze ultimas a la mar), but places the Cinaloas on the Fuerte, or, as he calls it, Rio Cinaloa or Rio Zuaque. He says (142) the river is called by various names, sometimes the Cinaloa, sometimes Tegueco, and sometimes Zuaque; that the four principal nations on this river are the "Cinaloas, Teguecos, Zuaques, y Ahomes," and that the Cinaloa dwell in the mountains at the head of the river. It is evident from this and many other similar statements in his work that Ribas considered the "Cinaloas" as distinct from the Hiaqui (Yaqui), the Mayo, Tehueco, and Zuaque, though linguistically related to them. If there was a tribe of this name, which is possible, it is most likely they were absorbed by the other tribes on the upper Rio del Fuerte. Therefore Hervas's identification of the Sinaloas with the Yaquis is an evident mistake, as Orozco y Berra points out. As to the application of the name Cinaloa by Ribas to the Rio del Fuerte there is this evidence. Alegre (1, 230) says—

> El *Zuague*, á cuya rivera austral estuvo en otro tiempo la villa de S. Juan Bautista de Carapoa, que despues fabricado el fuerte de Montesclaros, se llamó *Rio del Fuerte*, y el padre Andres Perez [Ribas] llama por antoñomásia el rio de Sinaloa.

The geographical position as given by Ribas is sufficient without any other evidence to show that he used the name Cinaloa to designate the Rio del Fuerte and not the stream which now bears the name Sinaloa. Nothwithstanding this and abundant other evidence that the Yaqui and the Mayo resided on the rivers that bear their respective names, and the Tehueco and Zuaque on the Fuerte river, Bancroft (1, 608) says, "The Zuaques have their villages between the Mayo and Yaqui rivers," and so locates them on his map (471). Possibly he refers to a more recent date, though apparently not. Hamy, probably by mistake, places on his map the "Hiaquis" on the Rio Mayo and the Mayo on the Rio del Fuerte.

That the Yaqui, Mayo, and Tehueco spoke dialects of the same language is now well known from historical evidence, vocabularies, etc. However, the following proof from older writers is added: "La nacion Hiaqui y por consecuencia la Mayo y del Fuerte . . . que en la sustancia son una misma y de una propria lengua" (Cancio, **2**: 246), "Esta tribu [Mayos] es de la misma raza que la del Yaqui, y solo se distingue por el titulo de su rio. Su idioma [Mayo and Yaqui] por consiguiente es el mismo, con la diferencia de unas cuantas voces" (Velasco, **1**:302). Pimentel (1, 485) says the "Cahita" language is divided into three principal dialects—Mayo, Yaqui, and Tehueco;

the others are secondary. Consult also Orozco y Berra (1:35); Buelna (x.), et al.

Investigation has failed to disclose how or why the name Cahita came into use, and why it was so seldom applied until in comparatively recent times. Even Hervas's work, which was published in the year 1800, makes no mention of it. Yet it must have been known early in the seventeenth century as the Arte de la Lengua Cahita por un Padre de la Compania de Jesus, republished by Buelna in 1891, and believed to have been written by Juan Bautista de Velasco (born 1562, died 1649), mentions it and entitles his "Arte" as that of the "Lengua Cahita." In his preface he says, "Toda esta usa de un mismo idioma, los Hiaquis, los Mayos y los Thehuecos, pero se diferencían en el modo." Juan Ortiz Zapata (393) uses the name (see below).

The lingustic relation of the Mayo to the tribes on the Sinaloa was noticed by the first Spanish explorers of this region, as the fact is expressly mentioned in the Segunda Relación of the journey of Nuño de Guzman.[1] While Ribas constantly joins together the Cinaloa, Zuaque, Tehueco, and Ahome of the Rio del Fuerte, and speaks of their similarity in customs, no reference to the relation of the language of the Cinaloas to the other three tribes has been found in his work. Juan Ortiz Zapata (393), speaking of the mission or Partido de la Concepción de Vaca, says it was on the banks of the "Carapoa" and that its natives spoke the Cahita language—"la lengua es caita." Orozco y Berra (1:332) says that this mission (Vaca or Baca) pertained to the Sinaloas, and that the ancient villages of Carapoa, Savirijoa, and San José Charay corresponded to the "Tehuecos." Hrdlička (1: 59) makes Bacabach a Mayo settlement, which is given as a probable synonym of Baca (Vaca) in the Handbook of the American Indians, though most likely different, as Baca (Vaca) was on the Rio del Fuerte. That tribes along the river spoke languages allied to Yaqui and Mayo has been shown and is asserted by Ribas (237); this makes them dialects of the Yaqui group. But are Cinaloa, Zuaque, and Tehueco to be considered synonyms or names of different dialects? The earliest original authorities do not make this clear.

Alegre (II, 10) contends that Zuaque and Tehueco are one and the same language—"de ser todos de una misma lengua." Buelna (x) says that Tehueco was the native and current idiom among the three indigenous tribes living on the banks of the Rio del Fuerte, the most northerly of those actually in the state of Sinaloa; the Sinaloa who inhabit the pueblos of Baca, Toro, and Sinaloita, on the river above the village of Fuerte; the Tehueco who lived in said village, previously called Carapoa, and in the pueblos of

[1] In Colec. Doc. Hist. Mex., II, 300; see Icazbalceta in the Bibliography.

Tehueco, Sivirijoa, and Charay, below the same; and the Zuaque, who were established still lower down in the pueblos of Mochicahuy and San Miguel de Zuaque. He therefore makes Tehueco, Sinaloa, and Zuaque one and the same dialect, though different tribes or subtribes. Orozco y Berra makes Sinaloa and Cahita equivalent, or one and the same idiom, but distinct from Tehueco and Zuaque, which he considers identical. "The language which Ribas and some other missionaries and writers call Cinaloa, and which Hervas names Yaqui, is the idiom which properly is known as Cahita." Quoting from Balbi (table XXXII) the following—

> Cinaloa is spoken in the provinces of Cinaloa, of Hostimuri, and in the southern part of Sonora, in the intendency of that name. This language embraces three principal dialects, quite different: the Zuaque, spoken in the southern part of the province of Sinaloa and in other places; the Mayo spoken along the Mayo river in Hostimuri and in Sonora· the Yaqui or Hiaqui, spoken along the Yaqui river in the province of Sonora—

he adds (356):

> We cannot agree with the greater part of these assertions. According to the grammar of this language, "no se llama Sinaloa sino Cahita," and contains three dialects [Mayo, Yaqui] and the Tehueco and also Zuaque which is used in Sinaloa by the Indians of the banks of the Rio del Fuerte.

Doctor Brinton (**3**: 125) gives Tehueco, Zuaque, Mayo, and Yaqui as subtribes of the Cahita, but omits the Zuaque from his list (**3**: 134). In the midst of this confusion it is the author's conclusion that perhaps Orozco y Berra is nearest right in identifying Zuaque and Tehueco as one and the same dialect, though distinct tribes.

Orozco y Berra (**1**: 35) says that about the mouth of the Rio del Fuerte were the Ahome, and along the coast south of it were the Vacoregue, the Batucari, the Comopori, and the Guazave: of the same family and idiom as the Cahita, the chief dialect being that named Guazave or Vacoregue. (Care must be taken to distingush between Comuripa (or Comoripa) of the Pima group and Comopori of the Yaqui group.) He says Balbi conjectures that Ahome and Comopori were quite diverse, or tongues related to Guazave. This he declares is not exact, as all these pueblos spoke the same idiom, and there was no particular Ahome or Comopori. In his classification (**1**: 58) he gives Vacoregue and Guazave as synonymous and as spoken by the Vacoregue, Guazave, Ahome, Batucari, Comopori, and Zuaque. The introduction of the last name here must be a mistake, as in his classification (**1**: 58) he places it under Tehueco; possibly it refers here to a few Zuaque who lived among the Vacoregue and adopted their language. This author appears to have worked this out by taking up the scattered statements of the original authorities in regard to the languages spoken in the different pueblos and missions, which it is not

necessary to give in this preliminary sketch. It may be stated, however, that Ribas (145) says the language of the Ahome was the same as that of the Guazave, and different from that of the Zoe (which is referred to farther on). Hervas (320) says the Ahome spoke a dialect of Hiaqui (he uses this name Hiaqui as equivalent to Cinaloa; see Orozco y Berra, **1**: 34), and the same as that spoken by the Guazave. Ribas (153) says the Comopori spoke the same language as the Ahome. Brinton is therefore in error in uniting the Ahome with the Pima, as they and the other pueblos mentioned in this connection, except Zuaque, spoke the Vacoregue dialect.

The names Oguera (Ohuera), Cahuimeto, and Nio, denoting three dialects marked by Orozco y Berra on his map, along the southern border of the Cahita territory, near the Vacoregue, are placed in his list of extinct idioms (**1**: 61). Comopori indicates a supposed subtribe, but is not represented on his map. Chicorata and Basopa are given in his list of languages, and are mentioned (**1**: 334) as on the Sinaloa river 7 leagues east of Ohuera; their languages are distinct and the two peoples speak "el Mexicano."

Of the Comopori, Orozco y Berra speaks as follows (**1**: 35):

> About the embouchure of the Rio del Fuerte live the Ahomes, and thence toward the south along the coast the Vacoregues, Batucaris, Comoporis, and the Guazaves; of the same family of the Cahitas, the idiom, the dialect of the principal one, named the Guazave or Vacoregue. Balbi conjectures that the Ahome and the Comopori are very diverse dialects or sister languages of the Guazave. This is not correct; all the pueblos spoke the same idiom, and there was no particular Ahome or Comopori.

This disposes of Comopori. As the Ahome spoke the same language as the Vacoregue and Guazave, the last two, so far as language is concerned, are, in fact, synonymous terms.

Cahuimeto and Ohuera are placed by Orozco y Berra in his list of extinct languages. His evidence for considering these as distinct and as once spoken in the area he has marked on his map appears to have been obtained chiefly from Zapata (407). However, Orozco y Berra makes a mistake in his notes (**1**: 334), referring to Ribas.[1] It is there stated that six or seven leagues southeast of the pueblo of Sinaloa was the pueblo of Ohuera, in which and in the vicinity thereof were spoken two languages, "distintas," called Cahuimeto and Ohuera, though at the time Zapata wrote (1678) the Mexican (Aztec) language had already come into general use, ultimately, as we may suppose, displacing them, as they appear to have been extinct when Orozco y Berra wrote his Geografía (1857–1863), and also probably when Alegre wrote his Historia (1766–1773), as he makes no mention of them, though he speaks of missions and Indians of the region referred to. As they resided on the Sinaloa (not Rio del Fuerte, but Sinaloa of modern maps) and along the southeastern border of the Cahita

[1] The pages he cites are those of Doc. Hist. Mex., 4th ser., III.

territory of Orozco y Berra's map, where it abuts on the Mexican (Aztec) territory, the two languages, which seem to have been cognate, may have been, and in all probability were, idioms of the Yaqui group. Although the evidence on this point is not positive, they were probably in the territory of the Yaqui group.

Orozco y Berra seems to be justified by the evidence in placing Nio on his map as a distinct idiom, though extinct. It is stated by Zapata (404–405) that a league and a half northeast of San Pedro Guazave was the pueblo of San Ignacio de Nio, in which the language spoken was "particular," called Nio, though Mexican was also in common use. The only subsequent mention found is that by Alegre (I, 294), who states that Padre Mendez commended the pueblos and languages of the Ocoroiri [Ocoroni], Nio, and some others which he had held, to the charge of Padre Tapia. This evidence, though direct, is somewhat slender, yet the name has been placed within the Cahita territory on the map accompanying this volume, surrounded, however, with a narrow line.

The evidence in regard to Basopa, which Orozco y Berra places in his list of languages, is very meager, the only notice, so far as known, being the statement by Zapata (408) to the effect that five leagues to the north [of Concepción de Chicorato] is the pueblo of San Ignacio de Chicuris. "The language is in part Tepehuana and in part Basopa, which is that which is commonly spoken." Zapata says, further, (407) that in Concepción de Chicorato the natives are divided into two parties which speak distinct languages, "the Chicurata, and the Basopa." This appears to be the only authority on which Orozco y Berra bases the introduction of these two names into his list of languages. Both are extinct.

Zoe and Tepahue

Zoe and Baimena, both extinct languages, can best be considered together, as it seems they were related.

The Zoe occupied a limited region on the eastern border of the territory of the Yaqui group, on the headwaters of the Rio del Fuerte adjoining the Tubar area. The tribe was a small one, speaking a language of its own. The Baimena, who joined them on the south, probably spoke a dialect of the same tongue. Ribas (208) says the Zoe were mountain Indians, residing about the headwaters of the Rio Sinaloa (del Fuerte) in the skirts of the sierra, and spoke a language different from that of the Sinaloas. He also states, page 145 ("tienen tambien amistad los Ahomes, y parentesco, y son de la misma lengua con los Guaçaues"), that they maintained friendly relations with the Ahome, and were related to and spoke the same language as the Guazave, who, as has been shown above, were related to the Yaqui group and spoke a dialect of their lan-

guage. Ribas also (145) mentions a tradition that this tribe came from the north with the Ahome, and, although speaking a different language and occupying localities widely separated, maintained constant friendship. As the language was still spoken as late as 1678, after the missionaries had established themselves in that section, and probably obtained this tradition from them, it is possibly reliable.

According to Zapata (396), the Baimena (or Baitrena, as the name appears there) occupied the pueblo of Santa Catalina de Baitrena, situated some six leagues southeast of San José del Toro, the head of the partido, and spoke a language somewhat different from that of the Troe (Zoe). The latter resided in a neighboring pueblo bearing their own name and, like that of the Baimena, bordering the Tubar ("confinan tambien con los Tubares"). The padre who ministered to these pueblos at the time Ribas wrote (1617–1640) was José de Tapia.

The evidence appears to warrant, therefore, in the absence of vocabularies, the acceptance of Zoe as a distinct idiom and Baimena as identical or closely related to it. There is, perhaps, justification for considering both as dialects of the Yaqui group, or at least Nahuatlan, and they are so marked in the List of Linguistic Families and Tribes. Their area is designated on the map accompanying this paper.

The territory in which the Tepahue (Tepave), Conicari, and Macoyahui dialects are said to have been spoken is situated on the northern border of the territory of the Yaqui group where it meets that of the Lower Pima and the Tarahumare.

According to Zapata (385), the language spoken in the pueblo of Asunción de Tepave (Tepaüe or Tepahue), situated five leagues northeast of Conicari, was "particular," and was known as "Tepave" (Tepahue); this was different from that of the other pueblos (Conicari and Macoyahui), though the latter people understood the Tepahue tongue and also that of the Yaqui group, but did not speak it. All three dialects are included by Orozco y Berra in the territory he marks "Tepahue" on his map, in the fork of the upper Mayo river. Ribas (253) speaks of them as friends of the Tehueco, and adds (265) that the pueblo of Conicari was distant from Chinipa sixteen leagues [west]. Zapata (384) says that the language spoken at this peublo is "particular," but that some of the inhabitants are Mayo "en la nacion y en la lengua."

The pueblo of Asunción de Macoyahui, in which the Macoyahui language was spoken, was situated about seven leagues north of Conicari (Zapata, 386), though Orozco y Berra on his map places it west of the latter pueblo. The language, according to Zapata, was "particular"—"la lengua es particular macoyahui con que son tres las lenguas de este partido"—these are Conicari, Tepahue, and Macoyahui. Although they were extinct at the time Orozco y Berra wrote his

Geografía (about 1860), they were in existence and use at the time Zapata wrote his Relación (1678). The Macoyahui were also known by the names Cue and Tecayagui. It is safe, perhaps, to assume that these languages were related to one another, though this is not stated, nor is there anything on record, so far as ascertained, by which to determine whether they were related to any language of the surrounding tribes. The only indications given on this point are that the Tepahue were friends of the Tehueco, and that some of the inhabitants of Conicari were of the Mayo tribe. These facts suggest relationship to the Yaqui group.

Tepehuane

(*Synonym:* Tepeguane)

The Tepehuane occupied the country mainly in Durango, immediately south of the Tarahumare, chiefly on the eastern slope of the Sierra Madre, from the twenty-fourth nearly to the twenty-seventh degree of north latitude. Arlegui (187) says it extended from the Sierra del Mezquital up to the Parral. According to Alegre (I, 319) it extended from a little less than the twenty-fifth to the twenty-seventh degree of north latitude, touching the Tarahumare region at the north.

The language does not appear to have been divided into any well-marked dialects. Pimentel (II, 63) says it consisted of various dialects, but the differences seem to have been too slight to receive any special notice. Orozco y Berra mentions none. It is possible that Acaxee and cognate idioms were related to it.

Acaxee

For the reasons given below, it has been decided to bring together under this tribal heading the four following names, which Orozco y Berra and other writers have treated as those of separate tribes, namely, Acaxee, Jijime (Xixime), Tebaca, and Sabaibo.

The four small tribes, or so-called tribes, speaking these languages formed a connected group surrounded on the north, east, and southeast by the Tepehuane and on the west and southwest by the extension of the Mexican group northward along the western coast. Their country lay chiefly in the high and rugged sierras. There seems to be little or no doubt, from the evidence given below, that they spoke closely related dialects, some so-called dialects, however, being apparently identical. It also appears that in addition to their native dialects, spoken among themselves, all used the Mexican language in their intercourse with others.[1]

[1] The term "Mexican," as used here and elsewhere in this paper when referring to language, is to be understood in the sense in which Orozco y Berra uses the term "Mexicano;" that is to say, it includes the central or strictly Nahuatl or Aztec group, the particular dialect of this northward extension being unknown.

Ribas says (491) the Sabaibo spoke the same language as the Acaxee, and that the Jijimes also spoke the same language (522). Alegre says (1, 422) the Sabaibo, though a distinct nation, spoke the same idiom as the Acaxee. Zapata (414–416), speaking of the missions in the Partido de San Martin de Atotonilco, says Tebaca was spoken in some and Acaxee in others when talking among themselves, but that all used the Mexican language. Orozco y Berra (**1 : 334**) asserts the same thing, and states also on the same page that Tebaca was distinct from Acaxee, but related to it. On the whole he seems to place all these dialects in his "Mexicano" (**1 : 12–13**), or at least includes the people in the Mexican (Nahuatlan) family in the limited sense of his classification. It is true that, in the paragraph indicated, he refers only to Acaxee, yet, as he holds that the other three are related to it, all must be classed together.

Hervas (on what ground does not appear) says that the Jijime language, which is spoken in the province of Topia, appears to be different from Acaxee (330), "and consequently from the other dialects of the Zacateco." This would imply that Acaxee and other allied idioms, exclusive of Jijime, were dialects of the Zacateco language. Referring to this supposition on the part of Hervas, Orozco y Berra (**1 : 13**) states that it is unsupported by any works he has examined.

As Acaxee appears to be the most important of these idioms, it is concluded best to depart from Orozco y Berra's plan to the extent of including the entire group under this name and to mark the area occupied by them accordingly.

Several other so-called tribes or "naciones" are mentioned as residing in the immediate region now under consideration, as the Papudo, Tecaya, Vaimoa (or Baimoa), Topia, Hina, and Hume. The first three appear to have been considered by Orozco y Berra (**1:319**) as but mere divisions of the Acaxee, and the last two (**1:320**) as divisions of the Jijime. Alegre (1, 379–380) mentions the "Papudos" and "Tecayas" as belonging to the mission of San Andrés (Topia), but says nothing in regard to their language. Turning to Zapata (306), the statement is found that the pueblos of this mission spoke various languages, some Sabaibo, some Acaxee ("Aiage"), and others Jijime, but no mention is made of Papudo, Tecaya, or Vaimoa (Baimoa). As there does not appear to be any other evidence on this point, these three names—Papudo, Tecaya, and Vaimoa—may be dismissed as not denoting idioms.

Orozco y Berra makes Topia a synonym of Acaxee. In this he seems to be substantially correct, as it appears to be a geographical term designating the section in which the Acaxee were chiefly located. Ribas (531) says the Acaxee nation was the principal (head) of the two missions of Topia and San Andrés. Hervas (327) speaks of

Topia as another language or dialect of the group, which idea Vater has carried into his Mithridates (III, pt. 3, 138–139), though admitting relationship with Acaxee. Balbi makes it distinct from the latter; but Orozco y Berra (1:319) differs wholly from this opinion, considering the two as the same language. He quotes (1:314) manuscript authority showing Topia to be merely the name of a province or district.

Ahumada (96), writing in 1608, makes the Hume a "nacion" distinct from the Jijime, though speaking the same language. Ribas (562) says these Indians inhabit the highest part of the sierra as one goes eastward. Alegre (II, 199) also calls the Hume a "nacion" and says the name was given to them from the configuration of the natural defenses of their country. Hervas (327) expresses the opinion that the Hume (Huime, as he writes it) were related to the Jijime. Orozco y Berra also holds that both the Hume and Hina were related to, or rather were offshoots of, the Jijime.

Alegre, speaking of the Hina (II, 195), says they inhabited the most profound breaks ("profundisimas quebradas") of the center of the sierra and the margin of the Rio Piaztla, and spoke a diverse language. Notwithstanding this evidence, Orozco y Berra, who perhaps had additional data, although recognizing the Hume and the Hina as separate or distinct peoples, and giving them in his list of tribes, omits them from his list of languages, thereby expressing his belief that they did not speak distinct idioms. It is considered safest to follow his example.

In this connection it may be as well to refer to the Huite. Ribas (207) says their language was different from that of the Cinaloa (Yaqui group). Orozco y Berra (1:333) says they were a warlike tribe, at open strife with all their neighbors, and were anthropophagi. Their location was in the sierra, about "seven leagues from the Sinaloas." He adds that the name, which signifies "arrow" in Cahita, indicates relationship of idiom to this language. Although he gives the name in his list of languages, he omits it from the classification, map, and extinct idioms. It has been omitted from the classified list in this paper, and from the map, but with some doubt.

Cora

(*Synonyms:* Chora, Chota, Nayarita)

The people speaking this language live in the Sierra de Nayarit and on the Rio de Jesus María, in the state of Jalisco. They are the most southerly tribe of what may be termed the Sonoran group of the Nahuatlan family.

Orozco y Berra, whose mapping is followed substantially in reference to the Cora territory, has marked this area according to the best

early authorities, most of them in manuscript documents. Reference is made, however, to other authorities treating of the subject.

Alegre, after referring to the rugged, mountainous character of the district, says (III, 196) it joins on the east Nueva-Vizcaya, and on the north, west, and south Nueva-Galicia, extending from 22° to 23° N. lat. Pimentel simply says the people lived in the Sierra de Nayarit but is more specific in relation to the subdivisions of the tribe mentioned below. Orozco y Berra (**1**:279) says that, according to Mota Padilla (510), the area was included between 21° and 23° N. lat. and 261° and 265° longitude; and according to Revillagigedo, between 21° and 24° N. lat. and 266° and 269° "de long. del meridiano de Tenerife." Following the chart of Narvaez, he concludes the extent to be between 21° 20′ and 23° N. lat. and 5° and 6° W. long. from the meridian of Mexico City.

Joseph de Ortega, whose Vocabulario en Lengua Castellana y Cora was first published in 1732, says (p. 7, reprint of 1888) that this language consisted of three dialects: Muutzicat, spoken by those living in the center of the sierra; Teacuacitzica, spoken by those living in the lower parts of the sierra toward the west; and Ateanaca (sometimes contracted to Até) spoken by the Ateacari living on the banks of the Rio Nayarit. He considers the last as the Cora proper. However, the differences were so slight that subsequent writers do not appear to have considered them dialects representing subtribal distinctions. Orozco y Berra (**1**:281–282) includes the Cora in his Opata-Tarahumar-Pima family, and gives as divisions the Cora proper, Nayarit, Tecualme, Gecualme, and Colotlan. Nayarit, the name the people applied to themselves, is merely a synonym of Cora. Although Tecualme and Gecualme are included by Orozco y Berra in his list of languages, there is no evidence that they indicate dialectic divisions. Moreover, he gives them (**1**:280) as synonymous. (For *Colotlan*, see Tepecano, etc., below.)

Huichol

(*Synonym:* Guichola)

A tribe, formerly counted as a subtribe or division of the Cora of Jalisco, living in the rugged sierras on the east of the Cora, by whose territory they are surrounded on the north, west, and south, the Tepecano joining them on the east. Their language is closely related to the Cora, causing some early authorities to classify them as a division of the latter; but recent investigations, chiefly by Hrdlička, have led to the conclusion that they are more closely related to the Guachichile than to the Cora, and are apparently an offshoot of that tribe. This confirms the suggestion thrown out by Orozco y Berra (**1**:282), "que los *Huicholas* son los restos de los anti-

guos *Cuachichiles*," a suggestion which he says he neither accepts nor contradicts. As they are separated from the parent tribe by the intervening Zacateco, they are given a distinct area on the accompanying map, with the same number as the Guachichiles.

Tepecano, Teule, Cazcan, Tecuexe

Orozco y Berra places on his map, to the east and the southeast of the Cora, tribes or supposed tribes speaking these and some other dialects (Coloclan and Coca). As there is considerable doubt in regard to the existence of others of these tribes and dialects and to the linguistic relations of some of them, it is necessary to examine somewhat closely the meager data regarding them.

Of these, Coloclan may, so far as the name is concerned, be dismissed from consideration as it is nowhere mentioned in his work. It was evidently intended for "Colotlan" (also given incorrectly by Bancroft, I, 672, as "Cocotlanes"), as it occupies precisely the position given to Colotlan in the text. Colotlan, it seems, may also be dismissed, as Orozco y Berra (**2**:644), though locating it on his map (as "Coloclan") south of the Tepecano area and along the eastern boundary of the Cora territory, identifies it with Tepecano. Colotlan is marked on his map as a pueblo in the Tepecano district and is given by Doctor Hrdlička (**2**:399–402) as in the Tepecano area. It would appear safe from this evidence, which has been gathered from the early statements of the missionaries, to assume that Colotlan and Tepecano were one and the same idiom. As this writer classifies Colotlan as a dialect of Cora (Orozco y Berra, **1**:282), this, if correct, would bring Tepecano into the same relation, but Doctor Hrdlička has become convinced by recent investigations made in the section that the Tepecano were most closely related to the Tepehuane, and he gives a brief vocabulary as confirming this opinion (**2**:419–425). Tepecano is given substantially the same area on the accompanying map as on Orozco y Berra's map.

Coca is extinct if, in fact, it ever existed as a distinct idiom. It could not have been very different from Tecuexe if we judge by the slight notices left on record in regard to it; in fact Orozco y Berra includes the two in one area on his map. This leaves for consideration of this group of small tribes, or subtribes, so far as mapped by the writer quoted, the Teule, Cazcan, and Tecuexe.

Very little mention of the tribes speaking these languages has been left on record. Doctor Hrdlička says the Cazcanes occupied the land from the "Rio Grande" (Rio Santiago), bordering on the Tepecanos and Tecuexes. Herrera (II, dec. 4, 197) says merely that they are a nation which inhabit as far as the border of the Zacatecos, and that their speech is different from that of the Mexicans, although the Mexican language had extended into all

that region. Antonio Tello[1] refers to the Cazcan of Teul, Tlaltenango, and Xuchipila. It is somewhat singular that Arlegui, who gives a list of the "naciones" of this section (148–149), omits the name of the Cazcan, though mentioning the Cora, Nayarita (?), and Tepecano.

Orozco y Berra says (**1**: 279) that the Teule, or, as he terms them, "Teules Chichimecas," used the same idiom as the Tepecano. He bases this opinion on a statement in documents in the Archivo General. Romero Gil (491, 499) says that the Cazcanes, whom he terms "Cazcanes Chichimecas," were Zacatecos, and suggests that the Tecuexes were a Mexican colony. In the article cited above Hrdlička (428) mentions the living remnant of the "Teul-Chichimecs" he found in two old villages near Teul.

Names of Tribes in Northwestern Mexico not Considered Separately

as given by orozco y berra and other writers

Names of tribes or supposed tribes or subtribes which are mentioned by Spanish writers as "naciones" in what are now the states of Sonora, Sinaloa, Chihuahua, Durango, and Jalisco, or that area included on Orozco y Berra's map in the Concho, Tepehuan, and Acaxee areas, and the part of Mexico northwest thereof, which are not separately discussed in this volume, are as follows:

Ahomes
Aibinos
Alchedomas
Ancavistis
Anchanes
Arigames
Ateacari
*Ateanaca
Babispe (Bap'ispe) [on map]
Babos
Bacabaches
Bacapas
Bagiopas
Baimoas (or Vaimoas)
Bamoas
Baquiobas
Basiroas
*Basopas
Batucaris
Batucos
*Baturoques
Bayacatos
Biaras
*Cácaris
Cahiguas
*Cajuenches
Cánceres
Carlanes
Chafalotes
Changuaguanes
Chemeguabas
*Chemegues
Chemeguet
*Chicorato
Chicuras
*Chinarras
*Chinipas
Chiricaguis
Chiros
Chizos
*Cocas
Coclamas
Cocobiptas
Cogüinachis
Comoporis
Comuripas
Conejos
Contlas
Cuampes
Cues (los Tecayaguis)
Cuñai
Cutecos
Cutganes
Echunticas
*Faraones
Gecuiches
Genicuiches
Gileños (los Xileños)
Gojoles
Gozopas
Guaicamaópas
Guailopos
Guazarachis
Hichucios
Himeris
Hinas
Hios
Hizos
Hudcoadanes
*Huites
Humas (los Chinarras)
Humes
Husorones
Huvagueres

[1] In Colec. Doc. Hist. Mex., II, 376: see Icazbalceta, in the Bibliography.

Jalchedunes
Jallicuamai
Jagullapais
Jamajabs
Janos
Jocomis
Jumanes
Llamparicas
Maguiaquis
Mammites
Matapanes
Mejuos
Mezcaleros
Mimbreños
Movas
Muares
*Muutzizti [Muutzicat]
Navajoas
Navajos
Nures
Oaboponomas
*Ocoronis
Onavas
Ópas
Oposines
Orejones
Oronihuatos
Otaquitamones
Pajalames
Panana
Papudos
Pasalmes
Payuchas
Paxuchis
Piatos
*Piros
Poarames
Polames
Pulicas
*Putimas
Quemeyá
Quicamopas
Quihuimas, los Quiquimas
Quiquimas
Salineros
Sibubapas
Sisibotaris
Sisimbres
Sívolos
*Sobaipuris
Sovas
Sumas
Supis
*Tahue
Tapacolmes
*Teacuacitzisti
Tecargonis
Tecayaguis [see Cues]
Tecayas
Tecoripas
Tecuatzilzisti
*Tegüima (el Ópata)
Tegüis
Tehatas
Tehuizos
Temoris
Teparantanas
Tiburones
Tintis
*Tlaxomultecas
Tochos
Tontos
Torames
Vaimoas
*Vayemas
Xicarillas
Xileños [see Gileños]
*Yavipais, los Apaches
Yecoratos
Yuanes [Cuhana los Cucapa[
*Yutas
Zayahuecos
Zuaques, el Tehueco

LANGUAGES FROM OROZCO Y BERRA WITHOUT TRIBAL NAMES

*Mediotaguel
*Pacasa

TRIBAL NAMES FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES

Buasdabas
Cumupas
Nacameris
Nacosuras

This area is thus marked off from the rest of Mexico because these supposed "naciones" were included therein by the writers who mention them, though in some cases erroneously, according to the boundaries of the present day.

There are several reasons why none of these names have been recognized on the map, some of which are given in the notes following. In some instances the names have reference to villages in which the language spoken was one already mentioned, and marked on the map. In other cases there is no evidence that the people named spoke a distinct language or dialect. In some instances in which it is stated the dialect was distinct, it is impossible, from the evidence, to classify it or to determine that it should be placed in the list of real unclassified languages. The first and largest portion of the names is from Orozco y Berra's list of tribes (**1**:67–76); the second portion is from his list of languages (**1**:62–66), for which he presents no tribal names, while the third part contains tribal names not mentioned

by him, but have been taken from other authors. The names to which the asterisk (*) is prefixed are those which correspond with names in his list of languages. This shows that the tribes not so indicated in his list of tribes were not considered by him as speaking distinct idioms.

If his conclusion be accepted without reserve, so far as the present investigation is concerned all the names in his list of tribes having no corresponding name in his list of languages may as well be excluded, but this would leave the whole subject to his judgment without investigation. It is proper first to ascertain how many names can be eliminated from the list as duplicates, or are otherwise clearly erroneously given, and also those already considered in the preceding notes.

Those of this list which have been noticed in the preceding notes, and a conclusion reached in regard thereto, are as follows (retaining the names as written therein):

Ahomes
Aibinos
Ateanaca
Basopas
Batucaris
Chicoratas
Chinipas
Cocas
Coguinachis (Opata Coguinachis)
Comoporis
Comuripas
Hinas
Huites
Humes
Movas
Muutzicat
Nures
Onavas
Papudos
Salineros
Teacuacitzica
Tecayas
Tecoripas
Teguimas (Opatas Teguimas)
Teguis (Opatas Teguis)
Vaimoas (Baimoas)

Those names which may be eliminated are as follows:

Alchedomas..... Same as Jalchedunes; in California-Arizona; Yuman.
Ancavistis..... A band or subdivision of the Faraon Apache.
Anchanes..... A division of the Concho, speaking their language and living on the Rio Concho (Orozco y Berra, **1**:325).
Ateacari..... A division of the Cora; synonym of Ateanaca, which denotes the language.
Bacabaches..... Orozco y Berra mentions the name in his list and refers to Sonora, but it is not found there. A Mayo settlement near Mayo river (?) using the Mayo language (Hrdlička, **1**:59). It is distinct from Baca.
Bacapas..... This name appears to have been given a place in Orozco y Berra's list without sufficient data in his text to justify its inclusion. A Papago rancheria.
Bagiopas..... In California-Arizona.
Baimoas..... See *Vaimoas*.
Baquiobas..... In United States, same as Bagiopas.
Basiroas..... A Lower Pima band. See *Hios* below.
Batucos..... Given by Orozco y Berra (**1**:344) as a synonym of Eudeve, though in the Rudo Ensayo (181 et seq.) it is alluded to as a pueblo.

Baturoques..... Merely mentioned by Orozco y Berra as an extinct tribe formerly living in Sonora. No particulars have been found. Probably a synonym of Batucaris.

Bayacatos..... This name is given in Orozco y Berra's list with reference to Sinaloa, but it does not appear in the text.

Biaris..... Orozco quotes this name from Alegre (I, 288), but this author, though mentioning the name, gives nothing by which to locate the people designated, nor anything in regard to their language. Probably the same as Biaras, a Tehueco settlement.

Cacari..... Mentioned by Fernando Ramirez (Orozco y Berra, **1**:319) as an extinct tribe formerly living in Cacaria, Durango.

Cahiguas..... Faraon Apache (Orozco y Berra, **1**:386), in northern Chihuahua? (See article *Kĭowa*, in Handbook of American Indians, pt. 1.)

Canceres..... Given as belonging to the Faraon Apache in Chihuahua (Orozco y Berra, **1**: 386). (See article *Lipan*, in Handbook of American Indians, pt. 1.)

Carlanes..... A Jicarilla band on Arkansas river. Bandelier, Archæolog. Inst. Papers, v, 191.

Coclamas..... Mentioned by Orozco y Berra (**1**:325) as near the Tobosos. No further information given.

Cocobiptas..... Orozco y Berra refers to Chihuahua, but it is not found in the text under this heading, though it is given under Coahuila (**1**:306) as from a list in the manuscript of Revillagigedo. No locality given; possibly in Texas. No additional data.

Conejos..... Mentioned by Orozco y Berra (**1**:327) as pertaining to the Concho; and (**1**:325) as being at the mission of Nuestra Señora de Aranzazu. No further data.

Contla..... Orozco y Berra (**1**:344) says merely it is stated that the inhabitants of Santa Cruz are of the "nacion Contla." Opata. As nothing further in regard to the name is found, it may be dismissed from consideration.

Cuampes..... A division of the Faraon Apache.

Cues..... See Tecayaguis.

Cunai..... Given by Orozco y Berra as connected with the Cajuenche, a Yuman dialect apparently in the United States. Nothing further stated. See *Cuñeil* in Handbook of American Indians.

Cutganes..... The Cuchan, or Yuma, in the United States.

Chafalotes..... Mentioned by Orozco y Berra (**1**:386) as a division or subtribe of the Apache; probably in Sonora.

Changuaguanes..... Given by Orozco y Berra as belonging to the Faraon Apache. Ute. (See article *Akanaquint*, in Handbook of American Indians, pt. 1.)

Chemeguabas..... In southern California, probably a part of or a synonym for the Chemehuevi. (See Garcés, 230–352, especially 351.)

Chemegues..... Synonym of Chemehuevi.

Chemeguet..... Synonym of Chemehuevi.

Chicuras..... Orozco y Berra gives the name (properly Cicuris) in his list. This is found (by reference to Doc. Hist. Mex., 4th s., III, 408—Orozco y Berra's reference to Ribas is an error) to be merely the name of a pueblo, the language being partly Tepehuan and partly Basopan.

Chiricaguis..... Name given to an important subtribe (Chiricahua) of the Apache, north of the international boundary.

Chiros..... Orozco y Berra gives this name in his list and refers to Chihuahua, but does not mention it under this heading. However, he gives (1:325), as apparently near the Toboso, the following: Sisimbre, Chizo, Cocoyome, Coclama, Tocho, Chizo, Babo, and Nure. It is probable, as the name Chizos is repeated, one should be Chiros, the change being a misprint. Bancroft (I, 610), in copying the list, omits one Chizos and does not give the name Chiros at any place. No further mention of it has been found.

Chizos..... No information regarding this supposed tribe has been found other than that given under the last preceding name.

Cutecos ..... See Husorones, below.

Echunticas..... Given as belonging to the Faraon Apache. (Given as a synonym of *Kotsoteka*, in Handbook of American Indians, pt. 1, 728.)

Faraones..... A division or tribe of the Apache.

Gecuiches..... In southern California; synonym of Shoshonean *Kawia*. (See Handbook of American Indians, pt. 1, 665.)

Genicuiches ..... Synonym of Serranos. (See Handbook of American Indians, pt. 2, 513.)

Gileños..... Synonym of Gila Apache, New Mexico. (See Handbook of American Indians, pt. 1, 492.)

Gojoles..... Mentioned by Orozco y Berra (1:279) as in Jalisco near the Tepecano. No additional information found. Possibly a synonym of Huichol.

Gozopas..... Orozco y Berra gives this name in his list and refers to Sinaloa, but it is not mentioned under that head. It is probably a synonym of Guazave as Ribas (211), to whom he refers on the page on which he mentions Guazave, gives "Gozaua."[1]

Guaicamaópas..... This name is given in Orozco y Berra's list with reference to Sonora, but is not found under that heading; however, it is in his classification, under "Yuma" (1:59). It is probably a synonym of Yacum, a Diegueño tribe, California. (See Handbook of American Indians, pt. 2, 982.)

Guailopos..... Orozco y Berra gives this name in his list, and in his text (1:324). He says, "En San Andres *Chinipas* vivian los Chinipas, á que se agregaron los *Guailopos* y *Maguiaquis*," referring in a note to "Cuarta serie de documentos [Doc. Hist. Mex.], tomo III, pág. 386 y siguientes." In the latter, the only reference found (387) approximating the statement in the text is that in the Partido de Santa Inés de Chinipa the language is called "Chinipa o Guaropaque." No San Andrés Chinipa is mentioned, but a "San Andrés de Conicari" (384) is given. Orozco y Berra (1:326) places the language in question under, and as included in, Varohio, as he does also Maguiaquis. As it is not given a place in his list of languages, it may be eliminated.

Guazarachis..... This name is given by Orozco y Berra in his list with reference to Chihuahua. It is not found under that head, but is given (1:386) as a Faraon division. The Handbook of American Indians (pt. 1. 511) refers to Guazarachic as a Tarahumare

[1] Orozco y Berra's references at this point (1:333) are erroneous, owing probably to typographical error. Note 3, "pg. 211," following "2 Cuarta Serie," etc., should be "Ribas;" and "4" and "5," referring to Ribas, properly refer to Doc. Hist. Mex., 4th ser., III.

settlement, and Guasarochic as a synonym. As it is not included in Orozco y Berra's list of languages it may be eliminated.

Hichucios ..... Orozco y Berra gives this (**1**:58, 335) as included under Tehueco, and as speaking the Tehueco dialect of the Cahita.

Hizos ..... The same author includes this under the Varohio and as speaking the same language, a dialect of Tarahumare.

Hudcoadanes ..... Name which seems to have been applied to a band of Yuma on the lower Colorado river, apparently north of, but near, the international boundary (Orozco y Berra, **1**:353; Doc. Hist. Mex., 3d s., 554). Given as a synonym of *Alchedoma* in the Handbook of American Indians, pt. 1.

Humas ..... Another name for the Chinarra (Orozco y Berra, **1**:69).

Husorones, Cutecos ... Pueblos or divisions of the Varohio, speaking the Varohio dialect.

Huvagueres ..... The only discovered reference to this group or band is by Orozco y Berra in his list and text (**1**:351) and Bancroft's quotation thereof. The former says, "Los *Hios*, á ocho leguas al Este de Tepahue, y los *Huvagueres* y los *Tehuisos* sus vecinos: más al Este seguian los *Basiroas* y los *Tehatas*." This would place them about the meeting point of the Lower Pima, Tarahumare, and Yaqui group areas. As Orozco y Berra does not include the name in his list of languages, it may be omitted. Lower Pima. (See *Basiroas and Hios*, p. 32.)

Jalchedunes ..... Mentioned by Francisco Garcés (Doc. Hist. Mex., 2d s., I, 346, 350) as a subtribe of the Yuma. Same as Alchedoma. In the United States.

Jallicuamai ..... Given by Francisco Garcés (248, 251, 346) as a Yuman tribe immediately north of the Cocopa on Colorado river, partly north of the international boundary line. Orozco y Berra (**1**:353) places them with the Cajuenche, both speaking the same dialect, which was very near that of the Yuma proper. The Handbook of American Indians (pt. 2, 340) gives the name as a synonym of Quigyuma.

Jagullapais [Jaqualla-pais] Garcés (309). The Walapai, a Yuman tribe north of the boundary line.

Jamajabs, Yamajabs, Tamajabs. Mohave north of the international boundary line.

Janos ..... Given by Orozco y Berra (**1**:386) as the Faraon Apache in Chihuahua. Bandelier (*Nation*, July 2, 1885) also says they were Apache.

Jacomis [Jocomes] .... An Apache tribe in Chihuahua.

Jumanes [Jumanos] ... A tribe probably identical with a part of the Wichita, formerly living about the junction of the Concho with the Rio Grande.

Llamparicas ..... A division of the Comanche in the United States—synonym of Ditsakana (Handbook of American Indians, pt. 1, 393).

Maguiaquis ..... Given by Orozco y Berra (**1**:326) as belonging to the Varohio, a subtribe of the Tarahumare. (See remarks under *Guailopos*, above.)

Mammites (Mamites) .. Given by Orozco y Berra as connected with the Concho (**1**: 325, 327). As this author gives the name in his list of tribes and does not place it in his list of languages, it may be omitted; moreover, the Indians referred to, if the name be legitimate, were probably north of the boundary line.

Matapanes..... Orozco y Berra (1:335) connects these with the Tehueco division of the Yaqui group, but does not include the name in his list of languages. (See remarks under *Biaris*, above.)

Mejuos..... Given by Orozco y Berra (1:327) in connection with the Concho. He says (1:325): "La tribu hablaba la lengua particular llamada *Concha:* mas no solo eran los Conchos quienes las componian, sino otra porcion de familias que usando el mismo idioma llevaban distintos nombres. Los primeros que se presentan son los *Mejuos;*" [etc.]. No authority has been discovered for this statement, which it seems he applies also to the Tapacolmes, Anchanes, Julimes, Cholomos, Mezquites, Cacalotes, Oposines, Conejos, Polames, Sívolos, Puliquis, and Pasalmes. For the Mejuos he refers to Alegre (II, 58), but turning to the latter author we find he merely speaks of drawing into the mission at San Pedro "more than two hundred families of Conchos, Mejuos, and other nations." Orozco y Berra does not give the name Mejuos in his list of languages.

Mezcaleros..... Faraon Apache, United States.

Mimbreños..... Apache in United States.

Muares..... Faraon Apache.

Navajoas..... Navaho in United States.

Oaboponomas..... Given by Orozco y Berra (1:59) under Yuma. In United States (Doc. Hist. Mex., 4th s., I, 349). Handbook of American Indians (pt. 1, 554) gives it as a synonym of Hoabonoma.

Opas..... Yuman, in United States. Synonym or abbreviation of Maricopa.

Oposines..... One of the names given by Orozco y Berra under Concho (1:55, 327). (See remarks under *Mejuos*, above.)

Orejones..... Belong to Faraon Apache.

Oronihuatos..... Given in Orozco y Berra's list with reference to Sinaloa, but it is not found under that head, nor elsewhere so far as discovered. Possibly a misprint.

Otaquitamones..... Connected by Orozco y Berra (1:325) with the Concho. (See remarks under *Mejuos*, above.)

Pajalames..... Same remark as under *Otaquitamones*.

Panana..... Given by Orozco y Berra as connected with the Faraon Apache. The Handbook of American Indians (pt. 2, 216) gives it as a synonym of Pawnee.

Pasalmes..... Found in the same connection as Pajalame, and is probably a synonym.

Payuchas..... Paiute in United States.

Pazuchis (Paxuchis).. Given as connected with the Faraon Apache, but are Paiute.

Piatos..... Given by Orozco y Berra (1:58, 353) as an Upper Pima subtribe in Sonora. According to The Handbook of American Indians (pt. 2, 241) a branch of the Papago.

Poarames..... Given in connection with the Concho. (See remark under *Mejuos*, above.)

Polames..... Same as Poarames, above.

Pulicas (Puliques).... Same as Poarames.

Putimas..... Formerly in Sonora. Extinct; no particulars given.

Quemeya..... Connected by Garcés with the Cajuenche division of the Yuman family. In United States.

Quicamopas..... Yuman, in United States.

Quiquimas..... Same as Quemeya.

Sibubapas..... This, according to Orozco y Berra (**1**:351), was the name given to the people of Suaqui, a Lower Pima pueblo. It is not included in his list of languages.

Sisimbres..... Mentioned by Orozco y Berra (**1**:325) as living near the Tobosos. Not in his list of languages. No further notice found.

Sivolos..... Mentioned in connection with the Concho (Orozco y Berra, **1**:327). Not identified; evidently distinct from the inhabitants of the ancient Cibola, the "province" of Zuñi in New Mexico.

Sobaipures..... Part of the Upper Pima. In United States. (Maj. J. W. Powell in *Seventh Annual Report of Bureau of Ethnology*, 98). Bancroft makes two mistakes regarding these Indians. In vol. I, 603, he locates them among the Lower Pima, and in his general index (vol. V) he places them with the "Pueblos." Extinct.

Sobas (Sovas)..... Pima subtribe included by Orozco y Berra in his list of tribes, but not in his list of languages.

Supis..... Given by Orozco y Berra (**1**:386) erroneously as connected with the Faraon Apache. Abbreviation of Havasupai, Yuman, in United States.

Tapacolmes..... Given by the same author (**1**:327) as connected with the Concho. Not included in his list of languages.

Tecargonis..... A band or pueblo speaking the Varohio dialect (Orozco y Berra, **1**:324). He refers in a note to the Doc. Hist. Mex., 4th s., III, 386 et seq., but the name is not found there.

Tecayaguis..... Orozco y Berra (**1**:356) places these among the extinct peoples of Sonora, with the following remark: "En las vertientes del rio [Mayo], antes de los Tepahues, se encontraban los *Tecayaguis, Cues* ó *Macoyahuis*, con su lengua particular el Macoyahuy." As this author does not include the name in his list of languages, it is probable that he intended by the above remark that the Tecayagui spoke the Macoyahui idiom.

Tecayas..... Mentioned by Alegre (I, 379–380) as in Topia apparently as the people of a pueblo, probably of San Mateo Tecayas, and by Orozco y Berra (**1**:55, 319) as speaking the Acaxee language. As the name is not given in Orozco y Berra's list of languages and as nothing more is found recorded regarding them, they may be omitted.

Tehatas..... Given by Orozco y Berra (**1**:58, 353) as a band or subtribe of the Pima in Sonora, but not speaking a distinct idiom. (See *Basiroas, Hios*, p. 32.)

Tehuizos (Tehuisos).. See *Huvagueres*, above; also *Basiroas, Hijos*, p. 32.

Teparantanas..... Orozco y Berra mentions (**1**:61, 75, 356) Teparantana as an extinct language of Sonora, without any particulars.

Tintis..... Orozco y Berra (**1**:58, 324) mentions these Indians as connected with the Tubar and speaking their language, but does not give the name in his list of languages.

Tochos..... Mentioned by Orozco y Berra as near the Toboso (**1**:325), and included in his list of tribes (**1**:75), but there is nothing to indicate that they spoke a distinct idiom.

Tontos..... Apache in United States.
Vaimoas (Baimoas)... The same is to be said as under Tecayas, except that these are not mentioned by Alegre at the place cited.
Vayemas..... Orozco y Berra (1:338, 356) mentions Vayema as an extinct language of Sonora, but gives no intimation as to its relationship or definite locality.
Xicarillas..... The Jicarilla Apache, in United States.
Xilenos (Gileños)..... An Apache tribe, in United States.
Yavipais..... A Yuman tribe, in United States.
Yecoratos..... Given by Orozco y Berra (1:333) as in the Yaqui group. A synonym of Chicoratos.
Yuanes..... Synonym of Cocopa.
Yutas..... The Ute, in United States.
Zayahuecos..... See *Torames*, p. 36.

Having thus eliminated those names which, for the reasons given, it is unnecessary to discuss here, there remain to be considered the following:

Arigames	Humeris	Sumas
Babos	Hios	Tahues
Batucos	Ocoronis	Temoris
Cajuenches	Piros	Tiburones
Coras (of Lower California)	Sisibotaris	Torames
Chinarras		

Idioms: Mediotaguel, Pacasa.

Also the list of names from other authors, as given above.

Arigames..... These are connected by Orozco y Berra with the Conchos (1:55, 325), but without any statement as to locality. Arlegui (109–110) says the missions of the Conchos were visited daily by families from the north. It is probable that, through these, names of tribes, bands, etc., both within and outside of the Concho area, were obtained which has caused so many names to be connected with the Conchos. Orozco y Berra does not include the name in his list of languages.

Babos..... Orozco y Berra (1:325) gives this name in connection with the Tohoso, but does not include it in his list of languages. As he states expressly that the supposed tribes, etc., named in this connection are believed to be related to the Apache, it is probable Babos was the name given to a band of Apache. It is somewhat singular that we find the Nure among them. He can not refer to the Nuri of the Lower Pima group.

Bapispes (Babispe)... Ribas (359); the inhabitants of the pueblo of Babispe, in the northeastern portion of the Opata territory. It seems they spoke Opata, though Ribas uses the term "nacion;" however, they were closely associated with the Potlapigua, a Piman tribe (Orozco y Berra, 1:348), and also with the Batuco (q. v., p. 26).

Basiroas, Hios (Ihios). The Hios, or Ihios as they are named by Ribas, are mentioned several times by this author (215, 227, 255, 274), but usually in connection with the Guazapares, Varohios, Temoris, and Chinipas, always with one or more of them.

Orozco y Berra (**1**: 351) mentions them as Lower Pima in connection with the Huvagueres, Tehuisos, Basiroas, and Tehatas, "Los Hios, á ocho leguas al Este de Tepahue, y los Huvagueres y los Tehuisos sus vecinos: más al Este seguian los Basiroas y los Tehatas."

The Huvaguere have already been referred to above; and precisely the same remark applies to the Tehuisos, Basiroas, and Tehatas. All these supposed tribes or subtribes, including the Hios, are located by Orozco y Berra between the Tepahue and the Varohio, which are not distant one from the other, and, according to his map, would lie directly along the border line between the territory of the Yaqui group and that of the Tarahumare. Although Ribas makes frequent mention of the Hios, he does not speak of them separately nor refer to their language; he makes no mention of any one of the other three names. Zapata (384–389), writing some thirty or forty years later, and referring to the missions and pueblos of this precise section, does not name any one of these four subtribes or their idioms, if different. Yet he does refer to the Guazapare and the Varohio, and to the pueblos of Chinipa, Conicari, etc., in the region mentioned, and to the language spoken therein. However, Alegre, writing in the following century, speaks of the Hios eight leagues east of the Tepahue and five from Comicari [Conicari], of the Huvagueres and Tehuisos, their neighbors, and of the Basiroas and Tehatas, a little farther in the sierra. This is evidently Orozco y Berra's authority for his statement, but as the statement by Alegre closes with reference to "otros pueblos," it seems evident that he uses the names mentioned as referring to villages. As there are no indications anywhere, not even in Orozco y Berra's list of languages, that these names bore any relation to distinct idioms, they may be eliminated.

Batucos..... Ribas (359) says they came from the north, and dwelt near the friendly "naciones"—Cumupas, Buasdabas, and Bapispes, extending down eastward to the Sunas. Kino, Kappus, and Mange (393) speak of Batuco as a geographical term—"los valles y pueblos de Batuco"—but a little farther on (400) make mention of the entrance of Padre Mendez into the "nacion" of the Batucos. Zapata (356) says the language spoken in the pueblo of Santa María de Batuco was Tehue. The geographical description gives the same location as the preceding. Azpilcueta (in Alegre, II, 186), referring to his visit to the Batuco, says their language is not difficult and appears to be much like that of Ocoroni. According to Velasco (Orozco y Berra, **1**: 343), Batuco was one of the pueblos of the Opatas Tegüis. As the name "Tegüis" seems to be pronounced *Te-gu-is*, it is possible that *Te-hu-e* is the same. If this be correct, the last two statements agree and the language spoken was Opata. The Tahue mentioned farther on must not be confounded with Tehue here: the former belonged to Sinaloa, the latter to Sonora. However, Orozco y Berra

classes Tehue with Eudeve, but without considering it a distinct idiom, as he does not include it in his list of languages.

Cajuenches..... After giving an extract from Francisco Garcés, Orozco y Berra (**1**: 350) says this may appear at first not to correspond with what he (Orozco y Berra) has said, as according to it the nations dwelling along the Colorado river, beginning at the mouth, were the Cucapa, Jallicuamay, Cajuenche, Jalchedun, and Jamajab, where he had placed the Quiquimas, Cuhanas, and Yumas. He claims, however, that the contradiction will disappear when we consider that the Cuhanes and Cucapas were one and the same tribe and that the others are nothing more than families [bands?] derived from the pueblos speaking Pima. As it is clear from Garcés' Diario that the Cajuenche were north of the Cocopa and were Yuman, they should be considered as belonging to the United States.

Chinarras..... According to Orozco y Berra (**1**: 325), the Chinarra, or Huma, occupied the pueblo of Santa Ana, in Chihuahua. This, he states, was situated to the southeast of the Tarahumare territory, apparently in the southern part of the area he has assigned to the Concho on his map. Arlegui (110) brings them into relation with the Concho, who, he says, anciently inhabited a large area and many pueblos, some of which were occupied subsequently by the Tarahumare. Then follows the list of other "naciones" of this region—Tobosos, Chizos, Cocoyames, Acoclames, Julimes, Tapacolmes, Chinarras, etc. Orozco y Berra, probably on the authority of Hervas as given below, says the Chinarras spoke a Mexican dialect ("dialecto Mexicano"). Hervas (312) says that the missionary Rafael Palacios informed him (in a letter) that the Cinarras dwelt about 28 leagues north of the Conchos; that while they spoke Spanish, yet he had heard them speaking together a language which to his ear appeared to be Mexican. They informed him that they were derived from the Conchos. It would seem from this that they lived near the international boundary line.

Coras (of Lower California). This name has been applied to a subtribe of the Waicuri, and is mentioned here merely to call attention to the distinction to be made between it and the well-known tribe of the same name in the state of Jalisco, discussed in the first part of these notes.

Cumupas, Buasdabas. Same reference and remark as under Bapispes, above.

Himeris (Hymeris)... Alegre (II, 343) says the Hymeri were a "nacion" situated in the various valleys formed by the Sierra Madre northwest of the valley of Sonora—that is to say, in the Opata country. According to Ribas, they were ferocious, holding friendship with no other people, from which fact Hervas (337) thinks it probable they spoke a dialect distinct from that of the Opatas, though they were related to that people. Orozco y Berra (**1**: 58) classes them with the Opata without idiomatic distinction.

Mediotaguei..... Same remark as for Tahue.

Nacomeris, Nacosuras. Ribas (358) mentions these two peoples as adjoining on one side the Hure (Opata) and on the other the Himeri. They were in fact pueblos, the first on the Rio Horcasitas and the other on the Rio Moctezuma. Zapata (352) says the language spoken at Nacameri was Huere (that is, Opata).

Ocoronis..... Ribas (34) mentions the Ocoroni in connection with Mocorito and Petatlan, the three on the first three rivers of Sinaloa, and says they are of "varias lenguas." According to Zapata (401) the inhabitants of the pueblo of Ocoroni, pertaining to the "partido" of Tehueco, in Sinaloa, and situated fifteen or sixteen leagues southeast of Mochicagui, spoke a distinct idiom called Ocoroni. Orozco y Berra (**1**:333) gives it as distinct, inserts it in his list of languages, and places it on his map adjoining Vacoregue on the east. Sevin (xxx, 12) says: "Towards the town of El Fuerte, and farther north, we find the Mayos Indians, to which belong also the tribes Quasare, Ahome, and Ocoronis." As there is some doubt in regard to this last statement, and as Orozco y Berra has evidently marked the space on his map with doubt, the name is omitted from our map. It is probable that the language was Tehueco, or a dialect of it.

Pacasa..... Same remark as for Tahue.

Piros..... The Piros, mentioned by Orozco y Berra (**1**:325–326) as inhabiting pueblos on the Rio Grande near the present town of El Paso, and speaking the Piro language, which he places in his list of unclassified languages, were in fact a tribe occupying numerous pueblos east of and along the Rio Grande north of El Paso nearly to Albuquerque. Bancroft (III, 714) gives a copy of what purports to be the Lord's Prayer in this language. The position of the language appears to have been determined with comparative certainty from a vocabulary obtained by J. R. Bartlett. From this Gatschet (416–417) brings it into the stock of the Rio Grande pueblos called Tanoan, and makes it the type of one of the divisions of this stock.

Sisibotaris..... Ribas (380) mentions the Sisibotaris as a subtribe of the Lower Pima, but does not say their language is distinct, nor does Orozco y Berra give the name in his list of languages. Alegre (II, 124) says they dwelt in some beautiful valleys surrounded by mountains not very high, that they were docile and different from the Yaqui and Mayo, quoting from Ribas, but adds nothing in regard to their language. Unless referring to Balbi's statement, Orozco y Berra (**1**:353) seems to make the mistake of calling them a subtribe of the Upper Pima, when immediately below (**1**:353, 58) he places them with the Lower Pima.

Sumas..... A semi-nomadic tribe about Casas Grandes, Chihuahua, and El Paso. Affinities unknown.

Tahue (Tahueca)..... This is mentioned by Orozco y Berra (**1**:336) as one of the extinct languages of Sinaloa. See *Batucos*, above.

Temoris..... Mentioned by Ribas (215) in connection with the Guazapares, Chinipas, and Hios, and as residing in the sierras, hence along the southwestern boundary of the Tarahumare territory. According to Zapata (390), the pueblo of Santa María

Magdalena de Temoris was situated in the partido of Santa Teresa de Guazapares, and spoke the same language, that is, Guazapare, a dialect of Tarahumare (Orozco y Berra, 1:324, 326).

Tiburones..... A name sometimes applied to the Seri, especially those residing on Tiburon island (McGee, 128 et seq.).

Torames..... Seems to have been a name applied to certain Indians living in the district of Zentispac, in Jalisco, and bordering on the Cora and Tepehuane. An associated group was known as Zayahuecos (Orozco y Berra, 1:278). Nothing is said by this author in regard to their language.

Zuaques (Suaqui).... These are to be distinguished from the Zuaques, heretofore described as belonging to the Yaqui group. It is properly Suaqui and denotes merely the Pima inhabitants of Suaqui, a pueblo in the extreme northern portion of the Lower Piman territory.

Concho

In passing to the northern central and northeastern districts one enters a region where nearly all the aboriginal languages have become extinct, and the little that remains on record in regard to them is not sufficient to make possible their classification with any degree of certainty. The most that can be done is to gather up the scattered notices of them found in the early Spanish writings and from these lay off the areas in such manner as seems most consistent with the data. This has been done by Orozco y Berra, who had access not only to the published works but also to the manuscript documents. His map, therefore, has been followed somewhat closely so far as this region is concerned.

The Concho resided immediately east of the Tarahumare, chiefly along the river that bears their name, from near its headwaters to its junction with the Rio Grande del Norte. The exact lateral boundaries of the territory occupied are not known, those given on the map being largely conjectural. Alegre (II, 58) says this "nacion," sufficiently numerous, extended to the banks of the Rio Grande del Norte; that they were confined on the north by the marshes and on the south held some pueblos of the Tepehuane; and "Valle de Santa Bárbara."

Orozco y Berra (1:325) says they spoke a "particular language called Concha." Although this statement is not sufficient of itself to indicate that it was without any known or supposed affinities, what follows in the same connection and in his classification (1:55) indicates that he considered it a distinct dialect of his "Mexicano," under which he classifies it, thus bringing it into the Nahuatlan family.

It is asserted by Hervas and others that the missionaries contended that they spoke a dialect of, or a language related to, the Mexican—

that is to say, belonging to the Nahuatlan stock. If it be true that one of the missionaries wrote an "Arte y Vocabulario" in this language, as asserted by Ludewig (52) on the authority of Arlegui and De Souza, this evidently shows sufficient study of the language to have given some knowledge of its affinities. That it could not have been related to the Athapascan group seems to be indicated by this evidence.

The several missions among the Concho gave the missionaries a good opportunity of studying their language and customs, and, where Indians of more than one language were collected, of comparing dialects. For example, we learn from Arlegui (97) that there were gathered at the Convento of the Valle de S. Bartholome representatives of the Concho, Tarahumare, and Toboso.

On the whole, the evidence seems strong enough to warrant us in placing the tribe in the Nahuatlan family.

Toboso

According to the conclusion reached by Orozco y Berra, as shown on his map, the Toboso occupied the region immediately east of the Concho and extending northward from a little below the twenty-seventh degree of north latitude to the Rio Grande del Norte, joining the Pakawan group on the east and the Laguneros (Orozco's Irritilas) on the south. Orozco y Berra (1:308–309) says they spread about the Bolson de Mapimi, and committing depredations in Chihuahua and Durango, as on the missions of Parras, and some of those in Coahuila and the north of Nuevo Leon.

Villa-Señor y Sanchez (II, 296–297) associates them with a tribe or people he names Gabilanes, and locates them, or part of them, in a region on the border line of Coahuila and Nueva Vizcaya, called the "Cuesta de los muertos." He gives as the number of Toboso of this group some 90 or 100 families. At another place in the same volume (349) he mentions as tribes living in this desert region and stretching along the banks of the Rio Grande, including part of the lands of Coahuila and northward, the Toboso, Gabilanes, "Tripas blancas," Xicarillas, and others, some of which were undoubtedly Apache.

It would seem from these items of evidence, from the additional fact that the Toboso are several times spoken of by the early authorities as being joined with the Apache in their raids, and from the savage, predatory character ascribed to them, that Orozco y Berra is justified in classifying them with the Apache (1:309).

The Cocoyome and Cabezas, which he mentions in the reference given, appear to have been embraced by him under Toboso. However, it is proper to state that Morfi (418) appears to distinguish between the Toboso and the Apache, but gives them like charac-

teristics. This distinction was at most probably nothing more than dialectic, and possibly only in name. It is justifiable, therefore, considering the data, to accept Orozco y Berra's conclusion.

Bancroft (I, 610) says, "The *Tobosos* are north of the Tarahumares and in the Mission of San Francisco de Coahuila, in the State of Coahuila," but this is evidently erroneous unless the reference is to scattered divisions. The location given on his map corresponds with this statement, the Tarahumare being placed along the extreme southern border of the state of Chihuahua. In the same volume (572) he says, "East of the Tarahumares, in the northern part of the first-named state [Chihuahua], dwell the Conchos;" and the latter are placed on his map in the northern part of Chihuahua.

Pakawan

Coahuilteco was adopted by Maj. J. W. Powell as the basis of a family name, Coahuiltecan, which appears to have included numerous small tribes in southern Texas and the adjoining portions of Mexico along the lower part of the Rio Grande del Norte, but it has been thought by the present writer that the native name, Pakawan, used by Gatschet, is more appropriate. Major Powell remarks as follows (68):

> On page 63 of his Geografía de las Lenguas de México, 1864, Orozco y Berra gives a list of the languages of Mexico and includes Coahuilteco, indicating it as the language of Coahuila, Nuevo Leon and Tamaulipas. He does not, however, indicate its extension into Texas. It would thus seem that he intended the name as a general designation for the language of all the cognate tribes . . . In his statement that the language and tribes are extinct this author was mistaken, as a few Indians still (1886) survive, who speak one of the dialects of this family, and in 1886 Mr. Gatschet collected vocabularies of two tribes, the Comecrudo and Cotoname, who live on the Rio Grande, at Las Prietas, State of Tamaulipas.

Bartolomé García in his "Manual para administrar los Santos Sacramentos" (title-page) names 17 tribes speaking dialects of this language. Adolph Uhde (120 et seq.) gives the names and locations of 74, based on previous works and his personal observations. It is scarcely possible, however, that these should be understood as tribes.

As the data are not sufficient to justify any attempt to locate the tribes or subtribes which dwelt south of the Rio Grande, except those identified by Doctor Gatschet, the writer has followed Orozco y Berra substantially in the area assigned to this family. Beyond this, with the exceptions mentioned, all is uncertainty and any conclusion mere guesswork.

Laguneros

The people included by Orozco y Berra under the name "Irritilas" are those to whom the missionaries and earlier authorities applied the term "Laguneros" adopted in the present work, the name

Irritila having been selected by Orozco y Berra because it was given by Ribas and some other early writers as the name of one of the tribes or subtribes of the Laguneros. The principal region occupied by them lay about the lakes of the table-lands of Mapimi, of which the most important was the Laguna de Parras (or San Pedro). The brief statement by Ribas (669) in regard to location is given in the note below,[1] where it is seen that he almost confines them to the region about the Laguna de San Pedro.

The southwestern boundary of the area appears to be approximately determined by another statement of the same author (673), that Cuencamé, a pueblo on the Rio Nazas, 8 leagues southwest of the lake, was peopled by Zacatecos. On the other hand, however, it is uncertain what languages were spoken by the Laguneros and what were their affinities. The author last quoted indicates that at the founding of the Parras mission by Father Juan Agustin the Zacatec language was used, at least in part. He states, however, in the chapter following, that Zacatecos came to the mission and joined those of the locality. In chapter x he refers to the "Iritiles" as one of the several "naciones" of the Laguna, and speaks of a "cacique de los que llamauã Iritilas."

Alegre (I, 380) says the people along the Nazas river and about the lake spoke rudely ("groseramente") the Mexican language (about the year 1600). In another place (I, 416) he mentions, as in this region, the Ochoes, a ferocious and inhuman people, and the Alamamas, a less barbarous people. The statement is made (Doc. Hist. Mex., 4th s., III, 33, under the title "Del Anua del año de 1596") that the Indians dwelling along the Nazas river were Zacatecos, but those at the "Laguna" are referred to as of another "gente," the name of which is not given. The same volume (54) mentions Irritila and Mexicana as languages spoken, the former being the idiom proper to that particular locality. On a following page (58) are mentioned the following "naciones" as coming from the surrounding country to join the Irritila in their religious festivities—Miopacoas, Meviras, Hoeras, and Maiconeras, and as coming from the lake, the Paogas and Caviseras, Vassapalles and Ahomamas, and the Yanabopos and Daparabopos (mentioned in pairs, as named here). However, it is not at all likely that these were all tribes or even subtribes, but mere bands, hence this reference can not be accepted as indicative of so many different idioms.

It is evident, therefore, that the data regarding the tribes of the region marked off by Orozco y Berra, under the name Irritila, are not sufficient to justify any decided conclusion regarding their lin-

[1] Y de los que nõbran Laguneros, poblados à las margenes de la laguna que llaman Grande de san Pedro, y algunos dellos en las isletas que haze la misma laguna. A la cabeçera desta doctrina, y Mission, dieron los Españoles nombre de Parras.

guistic affinities. The intimate relations of the Laguneros with the Zacatecos, however, lead to the suggestion that these two groups were probably linguistically related.

Zacateco

The Zacateco inhabited the state of Zacatecas and part of Durango, more especially those portions in the drainage area of Nazas river. Orozco y Berra on his map bounds their area on the north by that of the Irritila, on the west by that of the Tepehuane, and on the east by that of the Guachichile. On the south they are brought into relation with the Cora and some small tribes (**1**:285, 319).

It would perhaps be appropriate to allude here to that undefined group designated by the name Chichimeca, as the tribe now referred to was certainly included therein, but what is to be said on that subject will be given under a separate heading after a discussion of the Guachichile.

That there was a distinct tribe known under the name Zacateco, and that this tribe spoke its own appropriate idiom, are facts too well established to admit of doubt. Ribas (676), quoting from a letter of Padre Juan Agustin, one of the first missionaries to that section, says they gave religious instruction to the Indians in the Zacateco language, which they had acquired. Mota Padilla (194) connects the Cazcan with the Zacateco as speaking the same language. On the other hand, Hervas (311) maintains that the language was Mexican. He says their name, the names of their "poblaciones," and of their rivers, are Mexican. Orozco y Berra (**1**:285) agrees with Hervas on the point mentioned, as he says the Zacateco have their proper idiom, which is here classified as a Mexican dialect. If it be true, as stated by this author (**2**:644), that an "Arte y Vocabulario" of the Zacatec language was written by Father Pedro Espinareda, there is in this fact quite conclusive evidence that the missionaries recognized the language spoken by the Zacateco as at least idiomatically distinct from the other known tongues and as sufficiently varied to require a special acquaintance therewith to give religious instruction to the natives speaking it.

Unless the Cazcan and Teule Chichimeca were connected with them, there are no recognized subtribes of the Zacateco.

Guachichile

(*Synonym:* Cuachichiles)

This tribe, or group, says Orozco y Berra, occupied an immense area, embracing parts of the present states of Zacatecas, San Luis Potosi, Nuevo Leon, and Coahuila. According to his map, they connected on the north with the Irritila (Laguneros), on the west with

the Zacateco, and on the south and southeast with the Otomi. The missions established among these Indians by the Franciscans, according to the author last quoted (who gives as his authority a manuscript in the Archivo General), were San Luis, Saltillo, Venado, Charcas, Valle de Atotonilco, Pinos, Asunción Tlaxcalilla, and San Miguel Mezquitic.

Their language, says Orozco y Berra (1:285), was distinct. He says also, in another place (1:298), "su lengua 'era propïa,' y es una de las que han desaparecido." Laet (281) says that it was different from that of the Zacateco. Arlegui (86), speaking of the natives at and about the Convento of Asunción de Tlascalilla, one of those mentioned above, calls them "Guachichiles Chichimecos." Orozco y Berra (1:280) appears to bring together the Cazcan and the Guachichile as pertaining to the "Teules Chichimecas." When referring to the Indians of the region under consideration, Mota Padilla usually terms them Chichimecas. These people are classed as Nahuatlan, on the authority of Doctor Hrdlička, who states that the most intelligent man among the Huichol told him that Guachichil was the ancient name of his tribe. Doctor Hrdlička adds that the Huichol to this day go over to San Luis Potosi to camp during certain seasons of the year. This fact would account for Orozco y Berra's puzzle in not finding Huichol referred to in the early narratives.

The Term Chichimeca

It is probable that this term should be given a somewhat more definite signification than philologists appear disposed to accord to it. That it has been used in the past in widely different senses is true, but when the more extravagant applications are cast aside and the others are carefully studied, the use of the term is found to be more limited. The fact that it has been interpreted as a term of contempt signifying "dogs," or "dog people," even if correct (although it is really doubtful), does not necessarily mean that it was applied by those with whom it originated to any and every barbarous people. When this elimination shall have taken place, the name will be found to include people of more than one stock, yet it seems to have had a geographical limitation, and if the Otomi, or that portion of this stock usually included, be excluded, there appears to be to some extent a linguistic signification.

It is unnecessary to quote authorities to show that the name Chichimeca was applied geographically to tribes living north of Mexico City, as this is generally admitted. The range may be further limited, as follows: It does not appear that the name was ever applied to the Tepehuane in Durango, or to any tribe living north or west of them; it was never applied to the Cora on the southwest,

though the Teule and the Cazcan, residing immediately southeast of the Cora, were included by some authorities. On the south the name reached into the vale of Anahuac, but in this direction its application was very indefinite, being based largely on more or less mythical traditions. On the southeast the range was certainly bounded by the Huasteca. On the east and northeast it does not appear to have included the Tamaulipecan or the Coahuiltecan tribes. Nor does it seem to have extended northward into the regions assigned by Orozco y Berra to the Toboso and the Concho. This summary indicates as the area over which the name may have extended the sections marked on Orozco y Berra's map—Zacateco, Teule and Cazcan, Guachichile, Irritila, Pame, and Otomi.

It may be supposed that the name Chichimeca at first was applied indefinitely to all the wild and unknown tribes north of the City of Mexico, and that, as exploration progressed and more definite information was obtained, one tribe after another was eliminated from the scope of the term. This, however, is a supposition which does not appear to be supported by the facts.

A few of the early statements bearing on the subject are here presented. Quoting from a manuscript of 1579 by Gabriel de Chavez, Orozco y Berra (**1**:246–247) says of the "Señorio of Meztitlan," the country of the Meztitlateco, a Nahuatlan tribe closely related to the Aztec, that it (the Señorio) extended throughout all the sierra, bounded (on the east) by the Huasteca; that Xelitla was the most westerly point, one coming into contact here with the "barbaros Chichimecas;" and that the Señorio was bordered on the north by the Chichimeca. Following Pomar, he says (**1**:241) the name Tezcoco is from the term *tetzcotl* in the Chichimeca language. Further, he distinguishes (**1**:256–257) Mexicano (Aztec) from Nahuatl, the latter being the supposed language of the Toltec, including the Niquiran of Nicaragua, a distinction not accepted by philologists. This is mentioned, however, only to introduce the statement by him which immediately follows: "With respect to the Chichimeca we judge that it was a language different from the Nahoa, and are satisfied it has become extinct." He then refers (**1**:257) to a statement that at Pachuca in 1579 were spoken Otomi, Mexican, and Chichimeca, the last "a language not understood by the others."

Again (**1**:284), speaking of the Indians of Zacatecas, Orozco y Berra says:

> As has been a thousand times repeated, under the name "Chichimecas" are comprehended collectively all the barbarous and wandering tribes, but in reality the name corresponds only to the family or families which came from the north and were the progenitors of the nation which established itself in the valley of the kingdom of Acolhuacan. In this sense the Chichimecas extended from Zacatecas to Querétaro, the Rio Tololotlan forming the southern limit, occupying toward the east San Luis Potosi, and part of southern Tamaulipas.

He adds, however, that they did not all use the same idiom, and that those who wandered in the lands of the Zacatecas and the Aguascalientes took in common the name "Teules Chichimecas," but that they were divided into factions having particular idioms. Of these he mentions the Cazcan, Tepecano (who, however, as already shown, were probably connected with the Cora), and Tecuexe. Orozco y Berra considered Zacateco a dialect of his Mexicano. He seems to include also the Guachichile among the Chichimeca, although speaking a distinct language (**1 : 285**). The Indians of Aguascalientes he denominates "Chichimecas Blancos," but is not aware that they bore any relation to the Guachichile, though inclined to the belief that they were related to the Otomi (**1 : 286**).

Speaking of the Indians of Querétaro (**1 : 261**), and basing his conclusion on a manuscript of 1582, Orozco y Berra says the Chichimeca of this region were of the Otomi family. The Chichimeca of Jalisco (next to the borders of Guanajuato) are believed by him to have been Chichimecas-Blancos, hence of the Otomi family (**1 : 278**). Sahagun (656) says the true name of the Tolteca was Chichimeca. A little farther on, in the same chapter, he states that the Chichimeca form three groups—the Otomi, the Tamime, and the Teo-Chichimeca. He considers the last two of the same "race" and the more barbarous in their customs and mode of life, and states that those who mingle with the Mexicanos, or Nahua, speak Mexican as well as their own tongue, and those mingling with the Otomi and the Huasteca speak the languages of those tribes as well as they do their own.

Hervas (298) says that north of the Otomi were the Chichimecas who did not speak the Mexican language. Perez de Ribas (lib. 12, cap. 2) refers to their location as north of the City of Mexico, of their wild and barbarous habits, and of their division into numerous tribes speaking various languages, but gives no particulars in regard to these idioms.

The following information with regard to them is given by Villa-Señor y Sanchez (II, lib. 3, cap. 3). At Zelaya, or in its jurisdiction, there were "2,650 families" of the nation Otomi, descendants of the Chichimeca, who peopled these parts before the Conquest. Again (II, lib. 3, cap. 9), referring to San Luis Potosi, this author says it was on the frontiers of the Chichimeca. He states also in the same chapter that some of these Indians were converted at the mission near the pueblo of Santa Catarina Martyrs de Rio Verde. This indicates that the name Chichimecas was still actually applied in his day (1746). In the same work (II, lib. 3, cap. 10) he estimates the Indians of the jurisdiction of San Pedro Guadalcazar at about 2,000 families, all Chichimeca, some of whom had accepted the holy faith, and the various connected districts at 3,000 families, all Chichimeca. He speaks in like manner of these Indians at other places, recognizing them at that day as known by this name.

Taking all these facts into consideration, it is believed that a careful study of the subject would result in a more definite application of the name, at least geographically. However, it has received no linguistic consideration in the present paper, the majority of the groups formerly included under the name being herein placed in the Nahuatlan family.

Tamaulipeco

No attempt will be made at this time to determine the tribes or subtribes of the area so designated by Orozco y Berra on his map, further than what will be found in the notes below (page 45) on "Names of tribes in northeastern Mexico not marked on the map."

Pisone and Janambre

Orozco y Berra locates the area over which these tribes wandered at the southwest of the Tamaulipeco district, and says (**1**: 298–299) it extended from the valley of the Purísima on the south to the Rio Blanco on the north, being bounded on the west by the district of the Guachichiles. However, according to his map, it connects on the southwest with the district assigned to the Pame. He says (**1**: 296) that the Pisone and Xanambre (Janambre) belong to the same "family" and speak the same language, which is "particular." Arlegui (115), speaking of the Mission of San Antonio, says it was vexed by a warlike nation called Janambre. Orozco y Berra (**1**: 292, 293) speaks of them in like manner.

Villa-Señor (II, 56) locates some of the Indians of these tribes, somewhat definitely, at 20 leagues to the east of the pueblo of Tula.

These tribes are now extinct, but they seem to have been in existence as late as the first quarter of the eighteenth century.

Olive

Orozco y Berra locates on his map a small tribe with this name in the extreme southern portion of the Tamaulipeco district, on the southeastern border of the Pisone and Janambre territory. The name "Olive" is retained, as he informs us, because the proper native name is unknown. Nicolas León omits the tribe from his classification.

This author (Orozco y Berra) says they resided in "Horcasitas," near San Francisco Xavier mission. According to his authorities, they were recent emigrants from "Florida," i. e., the region between the Rio Grande and the Atlantic Ocean, had a knowledge of firearms, and were light colored (**1**: 293). The language is extinct.

Names of Tribes in Northeastern Mexico not Considered Separately

This is the proper place to allude to the names of the supposed tribes or subtribes of northeastern and eastern Mexico mentioned by early Spanish authors, but not marked on the accompanying map. As given in Orozco y Berra's list, these are numerous, but when examined are found to be limited mostly to the present states of Coahuila and Tamaulipas, of which, with very few exceptions, nothing more can be said than that they are found in lists or merely mentioned without particulars. The present author's method is therefore reversed here, and allusion is made to but very few of these names, of which some particulars are available.

It is quite possible that most of those mentioned as in Coahuila, chiefly along the Rio Grande, were Apache and Lipan, especially the former. The names near the Gulf coast, in part at least, may refer to the remnants of tribes forced thither by the stronger tribes of the interior. Orozco y Berra places on his map, on the Rio Grande near its mouth, the following names:

Pintos	Comesacapemes	Auyapemes
Tanaquiapemes	Catanamepaques	Uscapemes
Ayapaguemes	Saulapaguemes	Gummesacapemes

and in Tamaulipas the following:

Tamaulipecos	Caribayes	Comecrudos
Canaynes	Mariguanes	Malinchenos
Borrados	Panguayes	Ancasiguais
Quinicuanes	Anacana	Comecamotes
Tedexenos	Cadinias	Caramariguanes
Pasitas	Guixolotes	Caramiguais
Tagualilos	Pintos?	Aretines

All in the latter list are located by Orozco y Berra in his Tamaulipeco area, and north of Panuco river, while south of the river are only the well-known tribes, Huasteca, etc.

Of these names but little can be said, as all, or nearly all, are now extinct. Doctor Gatschet[1] in 1886 found some twenty-five of the Comecrudo at Las Prietas, Tamaulipas. The Cotoname were practically extinct, but one man being discovered. He obtained also information of the existence at La Volsa of two women of the Pinto, or Pakawa, tribe who, it was said, could speak their own language. The Cotoname of Doctor Gatschet probably corresponds with Catanamepaques of the above list. So far as known, these were the only tribes not wholly extinct at the time of Doctor Gatschet's visit (1886).

[1] See *Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, 68.

No published authority for any of these names other than Orozco y Berra's Geografía and what his statements are based on has been found. His authority, as he tells us (**1**: 291), is a manuscript in the Archivo General, by "D. Agustin Lopez de la Cámara alta. 1757."

Otomi

(*Synonym:* Hiā-hiū)

The Otomi in the limited sense, that is, the group speaking the Otomi language and its dialects, occupied a large area of central Mexico, extending from the vicinity of Mexico City northward to 22° N. lat., and east and west over nearly four degrees of longitude, joining the Huasteca on the northeast, the Nahuatlan on the northwest and southeast, and the Tarasco on the southwest. Orozco y Berra says (**1**: 17) the language is encountered in the state of Mexico, in San Luis Potosí, embraces all of Querétaro (then including the present state of Hidalgo) and a large part of Guanajuato, reappearing with the Tepehua about the Totonac area and at a point on the confines of Puebla and Vera Cruz. Languages related to the Otomi proper are the Pame, the Mazahua, and the Pirinda. The evidence Orozco y Berra presents as to the area embraced is a list of pueblos and curates in which the Otomi language is known to have been spoken.

It is unnecessary to quote the earlier authorities, as the name as used by them is not sufficiently definite to be applied to the Otomi tribe in the limited sense. Although it has been stated that there were numerous dialects in the speech of different pueblos, none save those mentioned above have been given.

As Orozco y Berra's mapping will not be followed in this instance the following statement by Prof. Frederick Starr (79–80) should be considered:

> Where the states of Hidalgo, Puebla, and Vera Cruz come together we find the strangest interminglings. There Aztecs, Otomis, Tepehuas, and Totonacs are surprisingly sprinkled. . . . In regard to this region, Orozco y Berra, usually so valuable, becomes frequently useless.

Orozco y Berra in mapping the Otomi has given the Pame and Mazahua separate areas and different colors; the Pirinda, however, is omitted, as stated below. In the map accompanying this paper the different areas are brought under one color, the Pirinda having its area and number as the other divisions.

A part of the Otomi, especially those toward the northwest, were included by some of the early writers under Chichimeca.

Pame

The Pame, as located by Orozco y Berra, were bordered on the north and northeast by the Pisone and Janambre, on the south-

east by the Huasteca, on the south by the Otomi, and on the west by the Guachichile. Their territory embraced parts of the states of Mexico, Querétaro, Guanajuato, and San Luis Potosí.

As shown in the note below,[1] Francisco Palou gives them a somewhat extended area. Orozco y Berra says (1:48): The Pame [dialect] is used in the mission of Cerro Prieto, in the state of Mexico, is extended principally to the pueblos of San Luis Potosí, and is also met with in Querétaro and in Guanajuato." He mentions also other pueblos in these states. Pimentel (II, 265) says it was spoken in San Luis de la Paz, the territory of the Sierra Gorda, city of Maiz, Department of San Luis Potosí, and in Purísima Concepción de Arnedo in the Sierra Gorda.

According to the last-named authority (II, 265) there were three dialects of this language—one spoken in San Luis de la Paz, one in the city of Maiz, and the third in the Purísima Concepción de Arnedo. No mention is made, however, of corresponding subtribes or clans.

This language has recently been assigned, with probable correctness, though not on conclusive evidence, to the Otomi stock. Alegre (I, 282) pronounces the idiom difficult, and compares these Indians with the Otomi of the same locality (San Luis de la Paz), apparently indicating a belief in relationship, though not expressing such an opinion. Villa-Señor y Sanchez (II, lib. 3, cap. 8), speaking of the Indians about San Luis de la Paz, says they are Pame, and, immediately after, that the Indians of this section speak Otomi.

Mazahua

The Mazahua area is located on Orozco y Berra's map in the southwestern portion of the state of Mexico, adjoining the Tarascan territory, though the traditional evidence locates the Mazahua more to the northeast.

Clavigero (I, 105–106) says:

> The Mazahuas were once a part of the nation of the Otomies, as the languages of both nations are but different dialects of the same tongue. . . . The principal places which they inhabited were on the western mountains of the vale of Mexico, and formed the province of Mazahuacan, belonging to the crown of Tacuba.

Orozco y Berra (1:256) says that in the time of Aztec control this tribe belonged to the "kingdom" of Tlacopan, its pueblos marking the limits between it and the Michoacan territory. Pimentel (II, 193), after quoting Clavigero's statement, remarks that in his day a remnant of the tribe was found in the district of Ixtlahuaca, belonging to the department of Mexico. Brasseur de Bourbourg

[1] Treinta leguas distante de la expresada Ciudad de Querétaro, y se estiende á cien leguas de largo, y treinta de ancho, en cuyas breñas vivian los Indios de la Nacion Pame.—Vida de Junipero Serra, p. 23 (fide Bancroft, I, 672).

(1: III, 56), alluding apparently to an earlier date, says their villages extended northward to within a short distance of the ancient Tollan or Tula. As usual, Orozco y Berra determined the boundaries by the pueblos inhabited by people of this tribe. The Mazahua is included in the colored Otomian area of the map accompanying this paper.

PIRINDA

(*Synonym:* Matlaltzinco)

Orozco y Berra (1:273) has not marked on his map the area occupied by the people speaking this idiom, doubtless because of the fact that it does not appear that they had, in the historical era, any definite territory, a portion mingling with the Mexicans, but the greater part occupying pueblos in the territory of the Tarasco. Clavigero (I, 106) merely locates them in the "fertile vale of Toluca," which is immediately south of the Mazahuan territory. This statement, however, appears to refer to the tribe before it was conquered by Axayacatl, "king" of Mexico, as indicated by Pimentel, who, in connection with the quotation from Clavigero, says, "anciently in the valley of Toluca."

In the present classification the author has followed Brinton by including the tribe in the Otomian area.

MECO

(*Synonym:* Jonaz)

Bancroft (III, 743), on what authority the author is not aware, identifies the people speaking this language with the Serranos. Nevertheless, in this way a difficulty otherwise unexplained is removed. He locates them "in the Sierra Gorda and in Guanahuato." But Alcedo (IV, 567) says they live in the pueblo Soledad de las Canoas, in the state of Querétaro. Orozco y Berra (1:264), whose statement is more exact, says they were gathered by the missionaries at the newly founded pueblo of San Luis de la Paz, and connects them with the people of San José Vizarron, in Querétaro. He also adds: "La parcialidad de chichimecos que fué congregada, pertenecia á la familia de los Tonases ó Jonases cuya lengua se llamó Meco por los misioneros lo mismo que denominaron la de los habitantes de San José Vizarron."

HUASTECA

As the relation of the Huastecan language to the Mayan stock is well known, it is necessary to note here only the evidence relating to the location of the tribe.

Marcelo Alejandre (162) says that, according to tradition, the Huasteca coming from the north established themselves first at the place now known as Altamira, in Tamaulipas, and afterward moved to the left bank of the Bar of Tampico. Sahagun (670) states that they lived in the province of Panuco, properly called Pantlan, or Panotlan. Pimentel (I, 5) says that at the coming of the Spaniards the place they occupied was at the north of the kingdom of Texcoco (Tezcuco), comprehending the north part of the state of Vera Cruz and a small part ("fraccion") of the bordering portion of San Luis. According to Orozco y Berra (1:206), their area extended along the Gulf coast from Vera Cruz to San Luis Potosí, extending probably some distance into Tamaulipas.

Totonac

As to their language and history, as well as to geographical position, the Totonac are one of the most interesting tribes of Mexico. The proper classification of their language has long been, and is still, in doubt, so much so that it is usually given as an independent stock. It was on their territory that Spanish history and Spanish rule had their initiation in Mexico and Central America, when Cortés appeared on the scene in 1519.

The area they occupied was in the northern portions of what are now the states of Vera Cruz and Puebla and the eastern extremity of Hidalgo, the Gulf coast forming the eastern boundary, and the northern boundary following closely the twenty-first parallel of north latitude.

According to the Arte of D. José Zambrano, which has been followed by subsequent writers, the Totonac language was divided into four idioms: Tetikilhati, spoken by the Tetikilhati in the high sierras; Chakahuaxti, spoken by Chakahuaxti in the pueblos of Xalpan and Pantepec; Tatimolo, spoken by the Tatimolo of the pueblo Naolingo; and Ipapana, spoken by the Ipapana in the missions of the Augustines. As these idioms have not been determined by subsequent investigation, they are omitted. The present tendency of linguistic opinion is to place the Totonac language in the Mayan family, thus bringing it into relation with the Huasteca. The long friendly relations between the two tribes correspond with this opinion. Orozco y Berra (1:214) expressed his belief in the relationship of the two dialects.

Tepehua

The Tepehua, which has been given as distinct by Orozco y Berra, and located on his map along the northwestern border of the Totonac territory, is in all probability related to the latter and should be placed in the same group. He says that, joined to the Toto-

nacs there is a section formed of various pueblos where they speak the Otomi and Tepehua languages. The latter he had not encountered outside of this locality, and had not been able to learn whether it resembles any of the known languages. He adds further that it is spoken exclusively only in the pueblo of San Francisco of the curacy of Huayacocotla. He considered the language as confined to the state of Vera Cruz. Prof. Frederick Starr (83–84), quoting his statement, remarks as follows: "In this he is in error. Huehuetla (district of Tenango, Hidalgo) is purely Tepehua, and a large town, Tlaxco, in the state of Puebla, is in part Tepehua." He suggests that the language is probably related to the Totonac, and this seems to be confirmed by the vocabularies given in his paper. It is therefore included in the territory of the latter on the map, and should be classified, as has been said, as a dialect of the Totonac.

Meztitlaneca

This language, which belongs to the Nahuatlan family, appears to be a dialect of the Aztec, and its area is included by Orozco y Berra in his Mexicano, without any reference to the fact in his text. The subtribe speaking the dialect inhabited the region north of Tezcuco, between the Sierra Madre and the Huastecan territory (**1**:246–247).

Although the relationship with the Aztec has been a matter of history from the entry of the Spaniards to the present time, the author is unable to refer to a vocabulary of the language.

Tlascalan

The area occupied by the Tlascala (or Tlaxcala) corresponds substantially with the present state of Tlascala. They spoke a dialect of the Aztec or Mexican language. This is so well understood, however, and so frequently mentioned, that it is unnecessary to add further evidence on the subject.

Cuitlateco

(*Synonym:* Teco)

Clavigero (1, 5) says:

> The Cuitlatecas inhabited a country which extended more than two hundred miles from the north-west to the south-east, from the kingdom of Michuacan, as far as the Pacific Ocean. Their capital was the great and populous city of Mexcaltepec upon the coast.

Orozco y Berra says (**1**:233) this language was spoken in Ajuchitlan, San Cristobal, and Poliutla, in the municipality of Ajuchitlan and district of the same name, and in Atoyac, in the district and municipality of Tecpan; and that the province of the Cuitlateco was comprehended between those of Zacatula and the Cohuixe. However,

this writer and Pimentel distinguish Teca or Teco from the Cuitlateco, the former (**1**: 196) giving as equivalents Chocho, Popoloco, Tlapaneco, Pupuluca, and Yope, thus bringing it into relation with the Mixe group, while the Cuitlateco is confessedly a Nahuatlan tongue, a mere idiom of the Aztec, though the author quoted says he does not attempt to classify it. That the two are merely different names for the same people is clearly demonstrated by F. Plancarte (1888).

In a note to the same article (26) Dr. N. León quotes from a work by Juan Joseph Moreno the statement that the language of the Cuitlatecos was "a daughter of the Mexican or the Mexican barbarized," and mentions an Arte by Dr. Martin de Espinosa.

Tarasco

(*Synonym:* Michoacano)

As the only subjects engaging attention here are the languages and localities, it is unnecessary to introduce evidence where these have been satisfactorily determined. As the Tarascan language is now well known as constituting a separate family, and as the extent of it as given by Orozco y Berra on his map is confirmed as correct by Pimentel, it is not necessary to present further evidence.

Aztec

(*Synonym:* Mexicano)

For the reasons given above under Tarasco it is unnecessary to add more here than the following statement. As Orozco y Berra, in laying off the territory in which this language prevailed, went over all the data available, taking pueblo after pueblo where it was spoken, it is necessary only to refer to his Geografía, and to add that two small areas in Sinaloa given by him under separate names, as stated above, have been included, and that the subtribes Tlascalan and Cuitlateco have been marked on our map in the Aztec area. Orozco y Berra (**1**:64) mentions as the states in which this language was spoken to a greater or less extent, Tabasco, Chiapas, Oaxaca, Puebla, Tlaxcala, Guerrero, Mexico, Michoacan, Colima, San Luis, Sinaloa, Durango, Zacatecas, and Jalisco. Professor Starr (33–34) says:

> There are people of Aztec blood in the Republic of Mexico from the state of Sinaloa in the extreme North-west to the state of Chiapas in the South. In Sinaloa, Jalisco, Durango, San Luis Potosí, Colima, Vera Cruz, Hidalgo, Oaxaca, Chiapas, and Tabasco they occur, while the states of Guerrero, Mexico, Tlaxcala, Morelos, and Puebla are in large part occupied by them. In some districts Aztec is the common language. In the Republic there are probably more than 1,500,000 pure blood Indians who speak the Aztec language (this includes the Tlaxcalans).

There is good evidence, nevertheless, that much of the area attributed to them, at least in northwestern Mexico, was standardized to Aztec

in comparatively modern times. At the same time the dialects so standardized were probably related to Aztec, and no extreme error will result from classifying them all as Aztec dialects. The entire Aztec area, as given above, is consequently brought under the same color as the other Nahuatlan dialects on the accompanying map.

Mixtec

According to Clavigero (I, 6)—

> Mixtecapan, or the province of the Mixtecas, extended itself from Acatlan, a place distant an hundred and twenty miles from the court, towards the south-east, as far as the Pacific Ocean, and contained several cities and villages, well inhabited and of considerable trade. To the east of the Mixtecas were the Zapotecas.

Orozco y Berra (**1**:189) says the Mixtecos extend into the states of Puebla, Guerrero, and Oaxaca, occupying in these the departments of Centro, Jamiltepec, and Teposcolula. Professor Starr (37) says:

> The country occupied by the Mixtecs extends eastward from the Pacific Coast in the high mountain country of the interior. Their territory lies within the states of Guerrero, Puebla, and Oaxaca, but chiefly in the last.

The area is usually divided into two districts: Mixteca alta, or high Mixteca, and Mixteca baja, or low Mixteca; but this division appears to have been given with reference to topography rather than to difference in idioms, though it is said that there are several minor dialects. Orozco y Berra mentions eleven dialects, as follows:

Tepuzculano, in Oaxaca
Mixteco of Yauhuatlan, in Oaxaca
Mixteca Baja, in Puebla and Guerrero
Montañes, in Guerrero
Cuixtlahuac
Mixteco of Tlaxiaco
Mixteco of Cuilapa
Mixteco of Mictlantongo
Mixteco of Tamazulapa
Mixteco of Xaltepec
Mixteco of Nochiztlan

Professor Starr (37) says:

> The language presents many dialects—Orozco listing eleven, of which that of Teposcolula is claimed to be the most important. Not only are different towns said to have distinct dialects, but even parts of the same town.

No attempt has been made, so far as known, to determine the differences between these dialects or to locate them more exactly than as given by Orozco y Berra.

Trike

This language, which belongs to the Zapotecan family, is spoken by a small tribe residing in the central part of the Mixtec area, and is considered by Belmar as more directly related to Mixtec.

Though giving the language as distinct without classifying it, Orozco y Berra locates the tribe in four curacies in Tehuantepec in association with, or in the vicinity of, the Chontal (**1**:186). Although

in most cases our best guide, it appears that in this instance he is in error. Francisco Belmar, who has made a study of this and other related idioms, says the language was spoken in only six pueblos: San Andrés Chicahuaxtla, Santo Domingo Chicahuaxtla, San Miguel Chicahuaxtla, San José Chicahuaxtla, San Martin Ytunyosa, and Copala, pertaining to the districts of Tlaxiaco (Tlajiaco) and Juxtlahuaca, which are in Oaxaca.

Professor Starr (42) says none of the towns mentioned by Orozco y Berra are Trike; that three are Chontal, and the fourth (Tenango) is perhaps Zapotec, and that the real district of the Trike is situated in the high mountains of the districts of Tlaxiaco and Juxtlahuaca, perhaps 200 miles in a direct line from Orozco y Berra's location. They form a little island of Trike speech in the midst of the Mixtec area. They occupy only five of the towns mentioned by Belmar, San Miguel Chicahuaxtla being a Mixtec town. The language spoken at Copala differs somewhat from that spoken by the other pueblos, though comprehensible to them.

The area occupied by this tribe is marked on the present map in accordance with this evidence.

Chocho

Orozco y Berra (1: 196) asserts that this language, which is related to Mixtec, has received the name Chocho in Oaxaca; Popoloco in Puebla; Tlapaneco in Guerrero; Teco in Michoacan; Pupuluca in Guatemala and in ancient Yope. As it is now known that Teco is Cuitlateco, a Mexican dialect, and that Pupuluca is given both as a Mayan and a Lencan idiom, these must be excluded; Yope also having dropped out of use, may be dismissed from consideration. This leaves only Chocho, Popoloco, and Tlapaneco to be considered. "Chuchon," which Brinton adopts in his *American Race,* is merely a variation of the name Chocho.

Professor Starr (71) assures us that in the district he visited there is a clear recognition that the language of the Chocho towns of Oaxaca is the same as the Popoloco of Puebla, and he is sustained by Orozco y Berra, but both are mistaken so far as the *ancient* Popoloco language is concerned, which was a dialect of Mixe. Professor Starr does not express an opinion as to the Tlapaneco.

Sahagun (671) says the Tlapaneco language is precisely the same as those called Tenime, Pinome, Chinquime, Chochontin, in the singular Pinotl, Chinquitl, Chochon. This brings Tlapaneco into the same relation as that given by Orozco y Berra. The name Chocho has therefore been applied to each of the three groups in the present map.

The Chocho group, according to Professor Starr, was situated in the district of Coixtlahuaca. This agrees with Orozco y Berra's map, in

which the area is around the pueblo of Coixtlahuaca, although he does not include it in his list of pueblos (1 : 196).

The Tlapanec group is located by Orozco y Berra in Guerrero, along the southwestern boundary of the Mixtec territory. The Popoloco, as stated above and demonstrated by a vocabulary collected by Dr. Berendt, anciently spoke a Mixe dialect.

Amishgo

(*Synonym:* Amusgo, Amuchco)

This language belongs to the Zapotecan family and appears to be a dialect of Mixtec. According to Orozco y Berra's map, which is followed here, the people speaking it occupied a wedge-shaped area extending northward from the Pacific coast into the Mixtec territory about the middle of its southern boundary. Villa-Señor y Sanchez (II, 162–163) refers to the tribe (subtribe) and the idiom, but does not definitely give the location. It is noticeable that the names of several of the pueblos mentioned by Orozco y Berra end in *tepec*, indicating the presence of a Mexican element.

Chatino

The Chatino are resident in Oaxaca, in the departments of Centro and Jamiltepec, and are wedged between the Mixtec and the Zapotec, extending from the Pacific coast northward. Orozco y Berra (1:189) says merely, "In the departments of Centro and Jamiltepec between the Zapotec and Mixtec," and gives a list of the pueblos where the language is spoken. He places it in his list of unclassified languages.

The author has not succeeded in finding the evidence by which to determine its linguistic relations, but following other writers it has been classed provisionally as Zapotecan.

Mazateco

The Mazatec tribe is located on our map in Oaxaca, along the northern border of the Zapotec area where the Puebla and Vera Cruz lines meet, extending slightly into the latter. Orozco y Berra says, in the department of Teotitlan; Professor Starr says, in the districts of Cuicatlan and Teotitlan; Belmar (2:1) says, in the district of Teotitlan del Camino, state of Oaxaca. Clavigero states that northward of the Mixtecas was the province of Mazatlan, the inhabitants of which were called Mazatecas (I, 6).

Orozco y Berra did not attempt to classify the language, but Pimentel was inclined to refer it to the "Mixteco-Zapoteco" stock, or what is here termed the Zapotecan family. This assignment is now universally accepted by students. It seems to be closely related to Chocho and Trike, especially the former. Belmar (2:1) says the lan-

guage is divided into two principal dialects, Mazateco and Izcateco, but makes no reference to the respective localities in which they are spoken, nor is anything stated with respect to subtribes.

Cuicateco

The people speaking this language are located by Orozco y Berra in the department of Teotitlan; Professor Starr says in what is now the district of Cuicatlan. Their area is marked by the former and also on our map on the northeastern border of the Mixtec territory and immediately south of the Mazatec.

The language belongs to the Zapotecan family; it does not appear, however, to have been carefully studied.

Chinantec

According to Doctor Berendt (Brinton, **3**: 144) the Chinantec language does not appear to be related to any of the surrounding tongues. He suggests as probable that there is to be found in it one of the original languages spoken before the advent of the Nahua, possibly the mythical Olmec.

The people speaking this language inhabited Chinantla in the state of Oaxaca, on the western border of Vera Cruz, and along the northern boundary of the Zapotec territory. Orozco y Berra expressed the same opinion in regard to the language as that subsequently given by Berendt, above mentioned. Pimentel was inclined to place it in the Zapotecan family, and this is the opinion of Belmar; but with our present imperfect knowledge of the language it is best to make it the type of a distinct stock or family.

Zapotec

The Zapotec group held a large area east of the Mixtec territory, including what is known as the Valley of Oaxaca. What Professor Starr means by saying "east and west of the old Mixtec territory" (45) is not clear. Clavigero (I, 6) says, "to the east of the Mixtecas were the Zapotecas." "The Zapotecas," says Williams (226), "constitute the greater part of the population of the southern division of the Isthmus [of Tehuantepec]." According to Shufeldt (125, 133–134) the Zapotec tribe inhabits the Pacific plains and the elevated table-lands from Tarifa to Petapa. The area given by Orozco y Berra on his map may be accepted, therefore, as correct.

As the Zapotec language is well known and is taken as the basis of comparison, it is necessary only to name the dialects which are mentioned by different writers. These are:

Zapotec Netzecho, which, according to Villa-Señor y Sanchez (II, 191–198), appears to have been the principal one
Zapotec Zaachilla
Zapotec Ocotlan
Zapotec Etla
Zapotec Iztepec
Zapotec Cajone

But the differences between these dialects appear to have been comparatively slight and not coincident with marked subtribal distinctions, hence no attempt has been made to place them on the map.

The Mixtec and Zapotec Languages Compared

Attention is called to the following question: Does the evidence justify the association of the Mixtec and Zapotec languages and their dialects in one stock, as they are now usually classified by philologists? We notice first that Friedrich Müller (Ab. 1) objects to this association, contending that the two languages are distinct.

Although Pimentel (I, 319) speaks of Zapotecs and Mixtecs as "tribus o naciones hermanas," he does not attempt the presentation of any linguistic evidence (it may be he does so in the second edition, 1875, 3 vols., 4to, of his Cuadro, which the author has not examined); nor does Brinton or any other author at hand except Nicolas León and Seler. In his introduction to the reprint of Cordova's "Arte del Idioma Zapoteco" (p. lx et seq.), León, copying his data chiefly from Pimentel, presents some arguments in favor of relationship. What value is to be attached to his argument from the grammatical standpoint the author can not say, but that of his brief word comparison is very small. First, it is brief, yet apparently as full as the data afforded; second, the words are culled to suit (observe Brinton's standard word comparison, **3**:339); and after all this care the similarity in several instances is not apparent, and the comparison forced. For example (p. lxvi): *Tres* and *ocho*, the former *ch-ona*, the latter *xo-ono* in Zapotec, to compare with *uni* and *una* in Mixtec.

Now "three" in Zapotec (same work, 176) is *chona* or *cayo*, according to relation, custom, etc.; and "eight," *xoono* or *xono* (see p. 177); *ch* and *xo* are never prefixes, so far as the author can find. In Charencey's comparison of Zapotec and Mixtec numerals (*Melanges*, p. 44), which takes in the numbers from 1 to 20 and includes, by tens, 30 to 100, there is scarcely the slightest resemblance, except in the plan or system of the formation of numbers, which is the same in half a dozen stocks in that part of North America. (See also list below.) It is probable that "one" in Mixtec should be *ce* instead of *ec*, as "eleven" is *usice* (10 and 1).

Seler (550 et seq.) gives a short grammatical comparison.

Attention is called to what appears to be some wide differences.

According to Pimentel (I, 41) the Mixtec letters (Spanish pronunciation, of course) are:

a ch d e h i j k m n ñ o s t u v x ó
ks gs y z dz nd tn kh

The Zapotec letters (Pimentel, I, 321) are:

a b ch e g h i k l m ñ n o p r t u x
y z th

According to Cordova (73) *c* (hard) is sometimes used for *g;* also *d* for *t,* and *s* for *x.*

From this it may be seen that the following are found in the former and wanting in the latter:

d j s v ks gs dz nd tn kh

though *d* and *s* are sometimes used for *t* and *x.*

In the latter the following are found which are wanting in the former:

b g l p r th

These are wide variations for cognate languages.

Next is given a list of words for comparison. The author would take a selected list, such as is commonly used in obtaining vocabularies, but he has only meager lists of Mixtec words.

LIST

	MIXTEC	ZAPOTEC
brother	ñani	beechebiobi
sister	kuhua	beelda
father	dzutu, yua	bixoce, bixooze
mother	dzehe, xi dihi	xiñaagaxana
man	yee	beni, benni, beniati
woman	nahadzehe	benigonnaa, benegonaa
day	yutnaa (manana)	chii, gobiicha, chee
bread (pan)	dzita	gueta
teeth	noho	laya, chitalay, layachita. (Sing.)
nose	dzitu	xii
ears	tutnu, dzoho	tiaga
forehead	tnaa	loocaa, loocuaa (of man or beast)
tree	yutme	yaga
hen	teñoo	berehualache, berezaa (bere?)
white	kuisi	nagati, naquichi, yati
I	duhu, ndi	nàya, a, a
thou	doho, ndo	lohui, loy, looy, lo
we	ndoo	taono, tono, tona, no
you (pl.)	doho	lato, to
for	saha	niiani, niiateni
on	dodzo, kodza	loo, chiiba, icqui
between	naho	late, lahui
with	sihi	nii, xii
nephew	dzasi, daxi	xinibeecha (m), xinibezaana (f)
head	dzini	icqui
eye	tenu	bizaalos, loo
mouth	yuhu	rua, rohua
tongue	yaa	loochi, looche, luuchi
hand	daha	naa
house	huahi	yuu, yoho
foot	saja	niia (pl.)

	MIXTEC	ZAPOTEC
1	ec (ce?)	tobi, chaga
2	wui, uvui	topa, cato
3	uni	chona, cayo
4	kmi, qmi	tapa, taa
5	hoho	caayo
6	ino	xopa
7	ucha	caache
8	una	xoono
9	ee	caa, gaa
10	usi	chii
11	usice	chiibitobi
12	usiwui	chiibitopa, chiibicato
13	usiuni	chiino, chiibichona
20	oco	calle
30	oconsi	callebichii
40	wuidzico	toua
60	unidzico	cayona
100	hohodzico	cayoa

We have also the comparison as judged by the ear. Remesal (321), speaking of Mixtec, says:

> Deprendio muy en breve la lengua de aquella nacion, que es dificultosa de saberse, por la gran equivocacion de los bocablos, para cuya distincion es necessario usar de ordinario del sonido de la nariz y aspiracion del aliēto.

Burgoa (Palestra, pt. 1. fol. 211, fide Bancroft, III, 749) calls it "la lengua dificultosissima en la pronunciacion, con notable variedad de terminos y vozes en unos y otros Pueblos."

This statement of its being difficult and harsh appears to be generally accepted. (See also Starr's statement, p. 37.)

On the other hand, Brasseur de Bourbourg (Esquisses, 35, fide Bancroft, III, 754) says, "La langue Zapotèque est d'une douceur et d'une sonorité qui rappelle l'Italien." Burgoa speaks of it in much the same way (Bancroft, ibid). In the "advertencia" to the anonymous Vocabulario Castellano-Zapoteco is the following statement: "Por la ortografía, y por muchas palabras y frases, personas inteligentes juzgan que presenta un lenguaje bastante alterado ya."

These facts appear to call for a careful re-examination of the subject by philologists.

CHONTAL

(*Synonym:* Tequistlateca)

The tribe here alluded to under the name Chontal includes the Indians forming a small group residing in the southern portion of the Zapotec territory on the Pacific coast. The area occupied by them is chiefly in the district of Tehuantepec, Oaxaca, extending to Guerrero.

Much confusion exists in regard to this name, as it is applied not only to the small group in Oaxaca but also to one in Tabasco and to another in Nicaragua, both of which are included by Orozco y Berra in the Mayan family. It is now known, however, that only those in Tabasco and some in Guatemala and Honduras to which the name has sometimes been applied belong to this family. The languages of the Oaxacan and Nicaraguan groups pertain to entirely different stocks. That of the former having received no satisfactory classification, Doctor Brinton (**3**: 112, 146) has applied to it the name Tequistlateca, from the principal village of the tribe, and placed it in the Yuman stock. As yet, however, this has not been accepted by linguists.

Professor Starr (67) insists that there was no necessity for the change of name made by Doctor Brinton, as the people call themselves Chontal and their language Chontal. He says also that Orozco y Berra is in error in calling some of the most important towns Trike pueblos; and that one in the list of Chontal towns he gives—Tlacolulita—is in reality Zapotec. León and Belmar have assigned the language to the Nahuatlan stock.

As the name Chontal applied to other groups should be superseded by more correct titles, there appears to be no good reason why it could not be retained for the Oaxacan tribe, as this is the name the people apply to themselves, but for the present it is deemed best, following Brinton, to apply to it as a linguistic family the name Tequistlatecan.

Huave

(*Synonyms:* Huabi, Juave, Guavi, Wabi)

A small tribe resident on the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, among the marshes on the Pacific coast, at the point where the Zapotec and Zoque territories meet, as located on Orozco y Berra's map. They occupy at present only four villages, one of those mentioned by Orozco y Berra—Ixhuatan—long since having been abandoned. According to their traditions they came from some coast region farther to the south—the last-named writer says from South America. Brasseur de Bourbourg (**1**: III, 3) says, on what authority is not stated, that in past centuries they possessed the province of Tehuantepec, and that they had been masters also of Soconusco, and had extended their conquest to Xalapa-la-Grande, of the Zapotec.

So far as known, the language can not be assigned to any recognized stock, although León and Belmar believe it to be related to the Maya; therefore for the present it must remain as the representative of a distinct family.

Mixe

(*Synonym:* Mize)

According to Orozco y Berra (**1**: 176) the territory of the Mixe embraced parts of the districts of Tlacolula, Villa-Alta, and Tehuantepec, in Oaxaca, bordering on the east with that of the Chiapanec. Professor Starr (53) locates them at present in the districts of Yautepec, Villa-Alta, and Tehuantepec. Garay says (60):

> The Mixes constituted formerly a powerful nation, and they still occupy the land from the Sierra, north of Tehuantepec, to the district of Chiapas. In the Isthmus they inhabit only the village of Guichicovi, and a small portion of the Sierra, which is never visited.

Seemingly forgetful of his statement in regard to the ancient territory of the Huaves, or alluding to a different era, Brasseur de Bourbourg (**1**: III, 34–35) says the Mixes possessed anciently the greater part of Tehuantepec, Soconusco, and the Zapotecan area, giving Burgoa as his authority. The Popoloco of Puebla are a branch.

The language of the Mixe is now fully recognized as related to the Zoque, and the two form the chief idioms of the Zoquean family.

Zoque

Orozco y Berra (**1**: 170) describes the territory of the Zoque as embracing parts of Chiapas, Tabasco, and Oaxaca, joining on the north the Mexican and Chontal areas, on the east the Tzental, Zotzil, and Chiapanec, on the south the Mexican, and on the west the Zapotec and Mixe areas. Williams (225) says:

> The Zoques inhabit the mountainous region to the east, from the valley of the Chicapa on the south, to the Rio del Corte on the north. Originally occupying a small province lying on the confines of Tobasco, they were subjugated by the expedition to Chiapas under Luis Marin.

The language, now well known, is taken as the typical idiom of the Zoquean family.

Doctor Brinton (**3**: 144) includes in his classification of this family two subtribes, the Chimalapas, "a subtribe of the Zoques" (no locality given), and the Tapijulapanes "on Rio de la Sierra," evidently the Tapachulteca (or Tapachula as on the map). The author has not succeeded in finding the authority on which the first is based, or whether it is to be taken as indicating a different dialect. However, this is repeated by Grasserie (6). The second may be based on the quotation in Pimentel (II, 236–243). But whether the language here referred to is to be considered different from Zoque is not clear, unless this inference be deduced from the few words and expressions given, which appear hardly to justify it. The relationship of Tapachulteca to Zoquean is, however, confirmed by Sapper.

CENTRAL AMERICA

As here defined, Central America includes not the group of republics to which the name is usually applied, but the geographical and ethnic Central America, lying between the Isthmus of Tehuantepec and the South American continent.

Chiapanec

Chiapanec was spoken in the interior of the state of Chiapas. Brasseur de Bourbourg (**2**: clvii, cxcix) places the tribe between the Zotziles or Quelenes on the south [east] and the Zoques on the north [west]; Orozco y Berra (**1**: 172) says, in Acala district "del Centro," and in the village of Chiapa, and in Suchiapa, district of the west. Pinart (in preface to Albornoz and Barrientos, 5) says, probably following Orozco y Berra, that this language was spoken in the village of Chiapa, at Acala, Suchiapa, and some other villages of the same locality, in the department of Chiapas.

The language, although as yet not thoroughly studied, is sufficiently known to make it the type of the small stock bearing the name Chiapanecan, which is represented at some two or three points farther south.

Chontal [1] (of Tabasco)

As stated above, there has been much confusion in the use of the name Chontal, which has been applied to tribes in Oaxaca, Tabasco, Guatemala, and Nicaragua, belonging to three or four different linguistic stocks. Those here referred to are, or were, resident in what is now the state of Tabasco. Herrera says (II, dec. 3, 211) that in Tabasco three languages were spoken: Chontal, used by the greater part of the inhabitants; Zoque, spoken in the sierras; and Mexican, which was brought into this region by the garrisons of the two forts Montezuma had established in it, namely, Zimatlan and Xicalango. That Orozco y Berra has mistaken the application of the name is evident, yet it does not follow that his map is incorrect as to the areas marked thereon.

Doctor Brinton (**3**: 149) informs us that it is seen from a manuscript vocabulary of the language by Doctor Berendt, that the Chontal of Tabasco belongs to the Mayan family and is practically identical with the Tzental dialect. Doctor Berendt (**2**: 137) confirms this and states that it shows only a dialectic variation from Tzental and Zotzil. This corresponds with Stoll's classification, whose vocabulary shows that it belongs to the same group as the Tzental and Chol. Although Carl Sapper (**2**: 359 and Carte viii et al.) recognizes

[1] This dialect and those which follow as far as Maya, inclusive, except Tapachulteca, belong to the Mayan linguistic family.

the Chontal through Stoll, he includes the area in the Chol type in his maps showing the distribution of the types of ruins. On the other hand, Juarros (I, 14) places Palenque in the province of the Tzentals.

With this evidence only, it is difficult to decide as to either name or area, and the author has concluded, therefore, that it is best to follow Orozco y Berra's mapping, which appears to be at least substantially correct, retaining the name Chontal temporarily, with the addition of the words "of Tabasco." Sapper's archeological types are too uncertain to be used as a guide in this respect.

Tzotzil

(*Synonym:* Zotzil)

As this is one of the well-known languages of the Mayan family, it is necessary only to indicate the locality in which it was spoken, and the possible synonyms.

The only question in the latter respect which arises is, whether the Quelene are to be considered the same as the Tzotzil, or whether they were two groups speaking the same or different dialects. That the name Quelene for some time has dropped out of use is evident. Herrera (II, dec. 4, 220) says that the province of Chiapas was divided among four nations, with different languages—the Chiapaneca, Zoque, Zeltale (Tzental), and the Quelenes, omitting any mention of the Tzotzil, who certainly resided in Chiapas. The inference from this fact is that by Quelene we are to understand Tzotzil. On the other hand, Juarros (**1**:II, 32) mentions in his list of Mayan and neighboring dialects the Tzotzil and the Tzental, but omits the Quelene. Orozco y Berra (**1**:168) thinks that from the Quelene "result" the Tzotzil and the Tzental. Doctor Brinton (**3**:86) omits the Quelene from consideration; but Stoll (**2**:86) says he finds the Tzotzil alluded to by the Spanish historians under the name "Quelenes." The latter conclusion appears to be the correct one.

In marking the territory of this tribe Orozco y Berra's map has been followed in the main, which, according to his usual custom, is based on the pueblos in which the language was spoken. In addition to the work of Remesal and other published works, Orozco y Berra made use of a manuscript furnished him by the Bishop of Chiapas.

Tzental

The territory of the Tzental is given by most authorities as included in the present state of Chiapas. Gage (236) says—

> The province called Zeldales [Tzentals] lyeth behind this of the Zoques, from the North Sea within the continent, running up towards Chiapa and reaches in some parts near to the borders of Comatitlan, northwest.

Orozco y Berra (1:169) says the language is peculiar to Chiapas, and this conclusion is followed by most recent authorities. As we have seen, Juarros includes Palenque in the area in which this language was spoken. Brasseur de Bourbourg (1:1, 63–64) hesitates between Tzental and Maya (proper), but the inscriptions agree better with the former than with the latter. According to the statement of Stoll (2:84), Doctor Berendt affirms that later the language spoken there was Chol, and this corresponds with Orozco y Berra's map and with Sapper's conclusion (2). It is therefore an undecided question how far northward the Tzental territory extended at the date of discovery. If Sapper's districting of the ruin-types (2:map VIII) could be accepted as a correct mapping of ethnic divisions, the Chol formerly extended over the Chontal area, the Palenque region, and the section occupied by the western Lacandon. This evidence is not of a character to be satisfactory in deciding this question, however, especially as Brinton, and apparently Berendt also, consider them relatively late comers to this region. The writer has been unable to find data on which to base a conclusion regarding this question, but is inclined to agree with Sapper in considering the ruins of the middle and lower Usumacinta valley as more nearly allied to those of Copan and Quirigua than to those of the intermediate Peten region. In this comparison, which must be close, details as well as general forms must be appealed to. These bring the ruins of Quirigua (which are ascribed by him to the Chol) and those of Copan (which he ascribes to the Chorti tribe) nearer to those of Palenque, Piedras Negras (see Mahler), and Menche in the Usumacinta valley than to those of the Peten region. This question will be further discussed, however, under Chol. The writer has followed Orozco y Berra chiefly, though not exactly, in outlining the area of the Tzental language.

Chol

The authorities differ widely as to the area over which this idiom was spoken. Orozco y Berra (1:167) says the Chol constituted a tribe established from remote times in Guatemala, which was divided into two factions by the incursions of the Maya. One of these divisions, he says, is encountered in eastern Chiapas, and the other, very isolated, in Vera Paz. He maps only the western division, as the other division lay beyond the Mexican boundary. Sapper, in his map V, which relates to present conditions, limits them to a small area in northern Chiapas, but in his map VIII, showing the areas of the ruin-types, the Chol type is in two sections, of which the western covers eastern Tabasco and northeastern Chiapas extending into northwestern Guatemala; the eastern division includes the extreme northeastern corner of Guatemala and a strip of Honduras along its

northwestern border. Stoll, in his map, gives an area extending across the north-central portion of Guatemala, spreading out to a considerable extent around the Gulf of Dulce. The fact that a portion of the tribe still resides in the vicinity of the Gulf of Dulce is confirmed by Maudslay. As Stoll's map relates to an earlier date than either of the others, and is based chiefly on the data furnished by Juarros, who names the pueblos where it was spoken, it probably gives more correctly the area formerly occupied by the tribe. As this author (Stoll) limits his map to Guatemala, the area in Chiapas is not given; however, it is referred to in his text (**2**:90) as including the pueblos Santo Domingo del Palenque, San Pedro Sabana, Salto de Agua, Tumbalá and Tila in Chiapas. He adds that a few Chol families are found in Tenosique in Tabasco. He states also that they claim their territory formerly extended from the borders of Chiapas to the Gulf of Dulce. Charencey (96) says the Chol commence about 23 leagues east of Cahabon. How this is to be understood is not very clear. The area as given on the present map is a modification of Stoll's map, so as to form a compromise with the other authorities. Pimentel and Orozco y Berra give Mopan as a synonym of Chol, though by others it is considered a subdialect of Maya proper.

Chañabal

(*Synonym:* Tojolabal)

The small tribe speaking this idiom is located by Orozco y Berra along the southeastern border of Chiapas where it joins the Guatemalan territory; Sapper's map v shows two small areas, one within the bounds given by Orozco y Berra between the areas assigned the Jacalteca and the Chicomucelteca, and the other about the pueblo of Comitan and wholly embraced in the Tzental territory: this map, however, relates to present conditions. Orozco y Berra seems to have included portions of the Chicomucelteean population, as one of the pueblos he names (**1**:167) is Chicomucelo. Charencey (95) limits the tribe chiefly to the parish of Comitan.

The Chañabal (Berendt writes *Chañeabal*) is placed by Stoll in his Tzental group, a classification which is now generally accepted. The area, as mapped in the present work, is a compromise between that of Sapper and Orozco y Berra, as the former is based on the present reduced state of the tribe, while the latter includes areas belonging to other tribes. In a subsequent work (**1**:132) Stoll includes the Jacaltenango pueblo in the Chuje (or Chuhe) territory, and corrects the mistake into which he had been led by Juarros in naming the language of this section Pokomam.

Chicomucelteca

This is the idiom spoken by a small tribe first brought to notice by Sapper, who considered it a dialect of Huasteca. He locates the tribe in southeastern Chiapas, adjoining the southern Chañabal area on the west, including the pueblos Chicomucelo and Montenegro. His mapping has been followed.

Motozintleca

This is also an idiom first mentioned, so far as the writer's data show, by Sapper. The locality indicated on his map v is a small area about Motozintla in the southeastern corner of Chiapas, in the western border of the Mam territory as given by him. Judging by the brief vocabulary it seems to be closely related to the Jacalteca. By mistake the Nahuatlan red on the linguistic map has been carried over the territory occupied by them.

Tapachulteca

Sapper mentions (**2**:244) and marks on his map v an idiom under this name which he makes a dialect of the Mixe, now well nigh extinct. The small area marked on his map is in the extreme southeastern corner of Chiapas and in the southern border of the Mam territory, embracing the pueblo of Tapachula. Charencey (91), Orozco y Berra (on map), and Stoll (**1**:134) state that the language spoken at Tapachula was Mam, but as the original tongue is dying out, both languages are probably spoken there. (See Zoque, p. 60.)

Subinha

Nothing further has been found in regard to this idiom than the brief vocabulary given in the Lenguas Indígenas de Centro-America en el Siglo XVIII. According to the brief statement at the end it was copied from the original "existente en este Archivo de Indias, bajo la rotulación de 'Audiencia de Guatemala.—Duplicados de Gobernadores Presidentes.—1788–1790.'"[1]

No attempt has been made to locate on the map the region in which this idiom was used.

Jacalteca

The writer has grave doubts as to the propriety of retaining Jacalteca and Chuje as names of different dialects. The vocabulary of the Chuje, which appears to have been obtained only by Rockstroh,

[1] It seems to have been obtained or transmitted with some explanations by Josef Anselmo Ortiz, who dates his communication Zocaltenango. As Zocaltenango is evidently the same as Jacaltenango, where the Jacalteca idiom (a close relation of the Chuje) was spoken, the vocabulary, which does not appear to have been well recorded, may pertain to one of the several dialects of this region.

is very brief and, if the writer may judge, not very carefully taken, notwithstanding that Stoll has followed it. Chuje and Jacalteca (of which we have a fuller vocabulary) are certainly very closely allied. The latter was spoken throughout a small area around the pueblo of Jacaltenango near the northwestern boundary of Guatemala. This territory is included in the area marked XV (?) on Stoll's map. Misled by Juarres, Stoll has marked the red area around Jacaltenango as Pokomam territory, an error he subsequently corrected. (See *Pokomam.*) It is located on the present map, pending the discovery of further evidence as to relationship with the Chuje.

Chuje

(*Synonym:* Chuhe)

This idiom, at present classed as a dialect of Chol, is most closely related to, if not identical with, Jacalteca; it is spoken now, according to Stoll (**1**:135), from Nenton to San Sebastian on the east. The area as marked by Sapper is in Guatemala near the western border, adjoining the Jacaltecan territory on the north, but does not include Nenton (or Neuton, as he writes it), leaving it a little to the west of the boundary he gives. His mapping is here followed, except that the boundary is carried westward to include Nenton.

Achis

It is said that this dialect (now extinct) was formerly spoken in Guatemala—Brinton (**3**:158) says in eastern Guatemala. As yet the writer has found no data on which this conclusion could be based except a mere mention by Palacio (20). As he names this tribe in connection with the Mam, their location in the eastern part of the republic would seem to be incorrect. Is it not possible they were the Aguacateca or the Jacalteca, tribes bordering the Mam territory? Of course this name has not been placed on the map.

Mam

(*Synonym:* Zaklohpakap)

As this language, which is considered one of the most archaic of the Mayan stock (Huasteca alone standing before it in this respect), has been rather carefully studied, it is necessary to call attention only to the habitat of the tribe. This was the western portion of Guatemala, extending westward for a short distance into Soconusco and southward to the Pacific Ocean. As Stoll's map is restricted to Guatemala, it does not show the extension into Soconusco. Orozco y Berra marks a small area "Mame" in the extreme southeastern corner of Soconusco, but Sapper gives a larger extension; the latter has been

followed in this respect in the map accompanying this paper, though Stoll has been the writer's guide as to the portion in Guatemala.

Ixil

This dialect is placed by Stoll in his Mam division of the Mayan stock. As the language is now well enough understood to classify it properly, it is necessary that we note here only the habitat. Stoll, the authority followed in this case, locates the area occupied by the tribe slightly west of the center of Guatemala, including the pueblos of Nebaj, Cotzal, and Chajul as the chief centers of population. As given by him, the Rio Negro or Chixoy formed the eastern boundary of the tribal territory at the time to which his map relates. The reduced area given by Sapper is included in that given by Stoll. According to the latter, it lay between the Mam area on the west and that of the Kekchi on the east, joining the Kiche territory on the south.

Aguacateca

This idiom also is placed by Stoll and philologists generally in the Mam division. The small area occupied by the tribe included Aguacateca and the present Huehuetenango, joining the Mam area on the north and west, and the Kiche territory on the east and south. The reduced area given by Sapper falls within the bounds indicated by Stoll. Although the dialect agrees most nearly with Mam, the strong influence of the neighboring Kiche and Ixil dialects is apparent in the vocabulary.

Kiche

(*Synonym:* Quiche)

The Kiche (or Quiche) dialect is second in importance and territorial extent only to the Maya (proper) of the languages of the Mayan stock; however, it is now so well known that comments are unnecessary here. Stoll makes it the basis of his Kiche division of the stock. The area occupied by the tribe was and still is quite extensive, including considerable territory in central Guatemala about the headwaters of Rio Motagua, and extending thence around the western side of Lake Atitlan southward to the Pacific Ocean, this southern extension being in contact with the Mam territory on the west and the Cakchikel territory on the east. Included are the following among the more important towns or pueblos: Santa Cruz Quiche, Rabinal, Totonicapan, Quetzaltenango, and Mazatenango. The somewhat diminished area designated by Sapper is included in the bounds given by Stoll.

Cakchikel

This is one of the dialects embraced by Stoll in his Kiche division: it is, in fact, but a subdialect of the Kiche. The tribe lives in the

central part of southern Guatemala. Their territory formerly included the area between Lake Atitlan and the vicinity of the present city of Guatemala, and extended southward to the Pacific Ocean, embracing the noted ruins of Santa Lucia and Iximchi. This area connects on the north and west with that of the Kiche, and on the east with the Pokomam and the Pipil territory. Among the important towns included are Solola, Tecpam, Chumaltenango, and Antigua. The diminished area on Sapper's map is included in that given by Stoll, except at the northeast, where Sapper extends it northward to the Rio Grande (Motagua). This discrepancy is due chiefly to the difference in the maps with respect to the location of the river.

Pupuluca (a).—The vocabulary on which this supposed dialect is based was taken by Dr. Karl Scherzer (28–37) at St. Mary near Antigua, which is included in the Cakchikel territory. Doctor Brinton's assertion (**3** : 153) that "it is nothing more than the ordinary Cakchiquel dialect of that locality" seems to be justified by a comparison of the vocabularies, the difference arising chiefly from Scherzer's method of spelling and the insertion of prefixes. Scherzer names it "Pupuluca Cakchikel." It is not entitled to a place as a dialect.

Tzutuhil

(*Synonym:* Zutuhil)

This is a dialect of the Kiche division spoken over a small area around the southern shore of Lake Atitlan, with the ancient Atitlan as its chief pueblo. The territory of the tribe is wedged in between the Kiche and Cakchikel areas. The bounds given by Stoll and Sapper are substantially the same and are followed on the accompanying map.

Uspanteca

The dialect of a small tribe situated near the center of Guatemala, precisely at the meeting point of the Kiche, Ixil, and Pokonchi territories, and, according to Stoll's map, in the great bend of the Chixoy river (Rio Negro). The chief pueblo is San Miguel Uspantan. Sapper's map places the area slightly farther from the river.

Kekchi

(*Synonyms:* K'aktchi or Quekchi)

Kekchi was spoken by a considerable tribe in central Guatemala. The area occupied spread out on both sides of the upper Cahabon river, extending westward to the river Chixoy, including the Coban, San Pedro Carcha, Cahabon, and Lanquin pueblos. Pinart (**4** : preface) says this language is spoken throughout the ancient province of Vera Paz, and that it has various dialects. It is classed

by Stoll in his Pokonchi division. The writer has followed Stoll's map, with which Sapper's agrees so far as he has given the area.

Pokonchi

This Mayan dialect, which Stoll has made the type of his Pokonchi division, was spoken throughout a fairly extensive territory in the center of Guatemala, about the headwaters of the Cahabon river, which included the pueblos Tactic, Tamaja, and Tucuru. Its northern border, where it joined the Kekchi territory, extended a short distance south of Coban. Stoll's map has been followed, as Sapper's shows no difference except in the extent of the area.

Pokomam

(*Synonym:* Pokam)

This Mayan dialect, taken by some students as the type of the Pokonchi division of the stock, was spoken throughout a considerable region in southeastern Guatemala, including the capital of the republic, extending northward to the Rio Grande or upper Motagua, and eastward to the boundary line between Guatemala and Salvador. Other pueblos included are Amatitlan, Jalapa, Petapa, and Mita. The territory given on the accompanying map is in accordance with the eastern Pokomam area given by Stoll. The smaller western area around Jacaltenango marked Pokomam was so given erroneously on the authority of Juarres, as already stated. The error is corrected by Stoll in his Die Sprache der Ixil-Indianer (**1**: 152–153). Sapper's map shows two small detached areas, one at the western extremity and the other in the eastern part of the area assigned by Stoll, the remainder being marked as now wholly Spanish.

Chorti

This language is included by Stoll in his Pokonchi division, seemingly on the strength of the opinion expressed by Brasseur de Bourbourg (**2**: pp. lxxxiv, lxxxv, note 4), as he gives no vocabulary, but Sapper is inclined to place it in the Tzental group. Judging by the brief vocabulary, its closest affinity seems to be with Chol and Tzental, indicating that Sapper's conclusion, in which he follows Brinton, is correct. The territory throughout which Chorti was spoken lies along the eastern border of Guatemala, extending into Honduras and including the site of Copan. Eisen, as quoted by Stoll (**2**: 107), includes in the area Copan (in Honduras) and the high mountains around Jocotan (in Guatemala). Charencey (96) says the Chorti "flourished in all the province of Chiquimula (Rep. Guat.) up to the banks of the Gulf of Honduras [Dulce ?] and along the borders of the Rio Polichic [Motagua]." In his map (VIII) of ruin sites Sapper gives an

area of Chorti types extending from Esquipulas (on the boundary line between Guatemala and Honduras) on the south, northward to and including Quirigua, and from Chiquimula (Guatemala) on the west to Santa Rosa (Honduras) on the east, including Copan. In his map v, showing present conditions, the remains of the tribe are limited to a few very small isolated areas, chiefly about Chiquimula and Copan. In the map accompanying the present volume Sapper's boundaries on his map VIII have been adopted in a somewhat modified form, as Stoll's area does not appear to extend far enough northward; moreover, he does not mark on his map the portion in Honduras.

Maya Proper

(*Synonym:* Mayathan.)

This language, here termed in its limited sense Maya proper which Berendt (**2**: 137), following Landa (14), designates "Mayathan," according to the latter author (30) was spoken throughout the peninsula. Knowledge obtained since Landa's day has shown that the language, including some minor dialects, was used not only throughout the peninsula but had penetrated the borders of some of the adjoining territories. Galindo (148–149) says that in advance of the conquest by the Spaniards the people speaking this language occupied all the peninsula of Yucatan, including the districts of Peten, British Honduras, and the eastern part of Tabasco; Pimentel (II, 3) says, all Yucatan, Isle of Carmen, Pueblo of Montecristo in Tabasco, and Palenque in Chiapas. The evidence which has been presented and a comparison of the inscriptions and ruin types tends to exclude Palenque.

MAYA DIALECTS

Besides the chief language spoken throughout the peninsula—the Maya proper—there were three dialects, or rather subdialects, the differences being too slight to constitute distinct dialects, though, with the probable exception of the last, they represent separate tribes. These, which have been noticed by philologists, are Lacandon, Itza (or Peten), and Mopan.

Lacandon.—The people speaking this dialect inhabit, or in the past have inhabited, the mountainous region of the upper Usumacinta river, in northwestern Guatemala and eastern Chiapas. Escobar (94) says:

> A distinction ought to be drawn between the Western and Eastern Lacandónes. All the country lying on the W., between the bishopric of Ciudad Real and the province of Vera Paz was once occupied by the Western Lacandónes. . . . The country of the Eastern Lacandónes may be considered as extending from the mountains of Chammá, a day and a half from Cobán, along the borders of the Rio de la Pasion to Petén, or even farther.

Juarros (2 : 271) places the Lacandon along the Passion river. Squier (2 : 65) gives as their habitat "the vast region lying between Chiapa, Tabasco, Yucatan, and the republic of Guatemala." Berendt (1: 425) says "they are reduced to-day to a very insignificant number living on and near Passion river and its tributaries." Stoll, whose map is limited to Guatemala, indicates for this people only an area in the extreme northwestern corner of this republic. Sapper marks on his map v the Lacandon area as partly in Chiapas and partly in Guatemala, the territory in the former, which includes the larger portion, being situated in a triangle west of the Usumacinta river, adjoining the Tzental area; and the latter as extending in a narrow strip along the Chixoy, or Rio Negro, southward into the border of the Kekchi territory.

It is stated by some authorities that the Western Lacandones, who they claim are now extinct, spoke a language different from that used by those of the east. A subsequent examination has shown that the former people probably belonged to the Chol group, a conclusion which would account for the supposition that they are extinct. Charnay (437) places them on both sides of the Usumacinta in the region of Lorillard City (or Menche). They are not indicated on the present map.

Itza (or *Peten*).—Stoll's map gives no defined area for the people speaking this dialect, including it under Maya. This course is followed by Sapper also, on his map v; but in his map viii, showing the distribution of the ruin-types, he marks as the area of the Peten tribes all the northern part of Guatemala (except a small strip on the western side), extending south to the sixteenth parallel, or to the border of the Kekchi territory, and eastward to the Caribbean sea, omitting the middle portion of both the Chol and the Mopan areas as given by Stoll. From the writer's study of Villagutierre's History of the Conquest of the Itza he receives the impression that at the height of their power the Itza had extended their territory for some distance northward, in the form of a triangle, into the southern part of the state now designated Yucatan. This author says (489) that they hold toward the south the province of Vera Paz in the kingdom of Guatemala; toward the north provinces of Yucatan; toward the east to the sea; toward the west to Chiapas, and southeast to the borders of Honduras. This region corresponds very nearly with the area marked on Sapper's map viii, but it unquestionably encroaches on the territory of other peoples.

The language of the Itza was but slightly different from pure Maya; the language spoken by the inhabitants of Chichen Itza in the peninsula does not appear to have been other than pure Maya.

Mopan.—Very little is known in regard to this language, as no vocabulary of it was ever obtained, so far as the writer is aware,

unless, as he supposes, the few words gathered by Sapper belong to it. These, so far as they go, seem to confirm the historical evidence that the language was very closely related to, if not identical with, Maya proper. Pimentel and Orozco y Berra give Mopan as a synonym of Chol. Stoll assigns to them a considerable area in northern Guatemala in the form of a belt across the state between the Chol and Itza areas as laid down by him. Sapper gives as the area of his "Maya of San Luis" (which he identifies as the Mopan) a small belt extending across the southern extremity of British Honduras, and westward beyond the border of Guatemala, including San Luis. Stoll says (**2**: 94) that the Mopanas had on the south the Choles, on the east and north the Itzas, and on the west the Lacandones. As his map is limited to Guatemala it does not extend the area into British Honduras.

Alaguilac

Although this language is now extinct, the evidence presented by Doctor Brinton in a paper read before the American Philosophical Society, November 4, 1887, proves beyond doubt that it belonged to the Nahuatlan family and was closely related to, if not identical with, the Pipil dialect spoken in the territory adjoining. According to this evidence the area throughout which it was spoken was substantially the same as that laid down by Stoll—namely, in the eastern part of Guatemala, on the Rio Motagua. It included the pueblos San Cristobal Acasaguastlan, Chimalapan, Usumatlan, and Tecolutan, and, as Doctor Brinton states, also San Agustin. The data thus made known since Stoll's work was published require a slight modification of the boundaries given this tribe by him. Doctor Brinton says Chorti was spoken in the adjoining area, but Stoll surrounds the southern half by the detached Pipil area, and the northern half by the Chol area.

Pipil

As is well known, this language belongs to the Nahuatlan stock and is closely related to Aztec, being, in fact, but a dialect of that language.

The early habitat of the tribe as determined by Stoll and Sapper agrees so closely with that given by Squier (**4**: 348) and Juarros (**1**: II, 81), and the relation of the tribes as found by Alvarado in 1524, that it is necessary to describe here only their situation as set forth by the first two authorities. They were located in two separate areas. The larger territory lay chiefly along the Pacific coast in southeastern Guatemala, from the meridian of Escuintla eastward into Salvador to the lower southward stretch of the Lempa river. This territory was intercepted, however, by that of the Xinca tribe and by a colony of the Lencan stock, being thus divided into two parts, one in

Guatemala and the other and chief portion in Salvador. Sapper also represents a narrow extension of the Pokomam territory into the western section. The other division was located along the upper Motagua river in eastern Guatemala between the Chol and Pokomam areas. As stated above, the Alaguilac language, spoken throughout a small adjoining area, was probably identical with the Pipil.

Although on the accompanying map Santa Lucia Cozumalhuapa is included in the Cakchikel area, the writer is inclined to ascribe the sculptures at this place to the Pipil tribe, or at least to the Nahuatlan stock.

Xinca

(*Synonym:* Jinca)

This language, which, with its dialects, appears to form an independent stock, here named Xincan, was spoken throughout an area of limited extent along the Pacific coast, in the extreme southeastern part of Guatemala, extending from the Rio Michatoyat eastward to the boundary of the republic. It embraces three closely allied dialects, which it is deemed unnecessary to mark on the map, to wit, Sinacantan, Jupiltepeque, and Jutiapa, spoken, respectively, in the pueblos of the same names. Brief vocabularies of the three are given by Brinton (2).

Lenca

This language, which forms a distinct stock—the Lencan—seems to be known in some four or five closely allied dialects, the term Lenca not being applied to any one dialect, but comprehending all. From Squier's investigations and other data it appears that the Indians speaking this language formerly occupied a large area in central and western Honduras, extending to the Pacific through that part of Salvador lying between Lempa river and the Bay of Fonseca. The small district in southeastern Guatemala along the western bank of the lower Rio de la Paz, marked by Stoll (2) on his map as Pupuluca, from data furnished by Juarros, must be Lencan territory. There can be but little doubt that the people occupying this area and speaking the so-called Pupuluca dialect were closely related to or identical with the Lenca and constituted a colony of that tribe. This is clearly to be inferred from the fact that they were related to and spoke a language similar to that of the people of eastern Salvador, who were certainly Lenca. It is unnecessary to enter here into a further discussion of the varied use of the terms Popoloca and Pupuluca. In his List of Families and Dialects the writer has designated the Mayan Pupuluca (spoken near Antigua, Guatemala) as Pupuluca (*a*), and the Lencan Pupuluca (spoken along the Rio de la Paz) as Pupuluca (*b*). The

mistake of Stoll (2:27) in calling the Pupuluca (*b*) a Mixe dialect is pointed out by Brinton (3:152). The latter author appears to have made precisely the same mistake, however, in his paper on the Xinca Indians, read before the American Philosophical Society, October 17, 1884. On his map VIII Sapper places a Lencan colony—possibly intended to correspond with Pupuluca (*b*)—slightly farther to the northeast than the locality given by Stoll, who follows Juarros. The last-named authority (1:1, 98) mentions Conguaco as the pueblo of the people speaking this dialect, which is in the area marked by him. The other dialects were Guajiquero, Intibucat, Opatoro, and Similiton, spoken in central Honduras in and about the pueblos of the same names, respectively. Sapper (1:28) mentions also as dialects Chilanga and Guatijigua, spoken in and about villages so named, in northeastern Salvador. He fails, however, to furnish vocabularies by which to determine relationship, having obtained, it seems, only twenty words of the former dialect. Nevertheless, as the pueblos are in the region where Lenca prevailed, there can be but little doubt that they are local variations of that language. No attempt has been made to mark the areas of these dialects on the accompanying map. It is possible the Chondal of Squier, mentioned below, should be considered a dialect, for it appears from a statement by Brinton that Désiré Pector termed them "Chontal-Lencas."

From the data obtainable it is impossible to define accurately the boundaries of the chief Lencan area. The writer has been guided in this respect chiefly by Squier (4:378 et seq.), omitting, of course, his conclusion that the Jicaque and Paya belong to the same stock as the Lenca. He was inclined to include geographically not only the department of San Miguel in Salvador and those of Santa Barbara and Comayagua in Honduras, but also Choluteca and parts of Tegucigalpa, Olancho, and Yoro in the latter state (as they were then defined); also the islands of Roatan and Guanaja. After eliminating the territories of the Jicaque and Paya the writer has outlined the Lencan territory to correspond as nearly as possible with the most recent data. As mapped it appears to conform, at least in a general way, with Sapper's determination, except that it adds a small extension into Nicaragua to include Squier's Chondal, who, according to Brinton (3:149), are Lenca. It includes that part of San Salvador east of the Lempa river, the modern departments of Paraiso, Tegucigalpa, La Paz, Intibuca, Comayagua, and parts of Santa Barbara and Gracias in Honduras, and extends into the southern part of Segovia in Nicaragua.

Tlascalteca

This is a dialect of the Nahuatlan family, closely allied to the Tlascalan, which from a statement of Scherzer (456) appears to

have been spoken by a small colony in Salvador about Izalco. It is probably merely a subdialect of or pure Pipil, as the latter is, or was, the language common to that section. It has not been noted on the accompanying map.

JICAQUE

(*Synonym:* Xicaque)

This language, which, so far as known at present, was that of an independent stock here named Jicaquean, is, or was, spoken by a tribe of Indians living in northern Honduras. According to Squier (**4**:378) their territory extended from the Rio Ulva on the west to the Rio Negro (or Black river, also called Rio Tinto) on the east, though on his map they are placed between the Ulva and Roman rivers. How far back into the interior their district stretched is not stated, but it is known that it did not include Comayagua. Although Membreño (195) has a note on this tribe, he fails to indicate the locality further than by presenting the vocabularies of two dialects of the language—"Jicaque of Yoro" and "Jicaque of Palmar." He speaks of the latter as "cerca de San Pedro" (195); the other presumably was spoken in the district of Yoro, as the vocabulary given appears to have been obtained by an official of that district. The difference between these two dialects as shown by the vocabularies is as great, if not greater, than that between the Maya proper and the Cakchikel. The area for this tribe marked on the accompanying map is determined according to the writer's best judgment from the brief data obtainable.

PAYA

Like the preceding language, Paya forms a distinct stock which, following the rule established by Maj. J. W. Powell, has been named the Payan. Squier says (**4**:378), "The Xicaques, greatly reduced, exist in the district lying between the Rio Ulua and Rio Tinto, and the Payas in the triangle between the Tinto, the sea, and the Rio Wanks, or Segovia." On his map, however, he extends them westward to the River Roman (or Aguan). Membreño (195) states that the principal center of the Paya is the pueblo of Culmi, or Dulce Nombre, slightly south of the center of the area marked on the accompanying map. This area and that of the Jicaque are supposed to represent the territory of these two tribes before the incoming of the Carib, now occupying the coast. Bell (258) says they inhabit the headwaters of the Black and Patook rivers. Squier expresses the opinion that the territory of the Lenca extended to the north coast, but it must be remembered that he included the Jicaque in the Lencan group. Whether the Chol territory extended eastward to the Rio Ulua is somewhat doubtful; Sapper does not place it so far.

As no information in relation to the intervening strip is available, it is considered best to connect it with that of the Jicaque.

Carib

As the Carib of the gulf coast of Honduras were not established in this region until near the close of the eighteenth century, they may be omitted from extended consideration here, as they have been from the map. It is necessary to remark only that they are confined to the northern coast of Honduras. But one dialect has been noticed—the Moreno—a vocabulary of which is given by Membreño. He refers to the pueblo of Santafé de Punta-hicacos as inhabited by Morenos. Stoll locates a small colony about Livingstone, at the embouchure of the Rio Dulce, on the northeast coast of Guatemala.

Matagalpa

This is the chief if not the only language of a small stock named by Brinton (**3** : 149) the Matagalpan. Squier applies the name Chondal (Chontal of Oviedo and Gomara) in part to the people speaking this language, but without mention of any distinction. Recognition of this distinction is due to Doctor Brinton (**3** : 149), who obtained among the papers of Doctor Berendt a vocabulary of the language. The area occupied, having the city of Matagalpa as its central point, embraced a large part of the Matagalpa district, and extended into the districts of Segovia and Chontales in Nicaragua. Sapper (**1**: 29–30) says, "At present the Matagalpan language is spoken as an isolated dialect only in the Salvadorean villages Cacaopera and Lislique by some 3,000 persons." Whether this dialect differs in any respect from Matagalpa proper is not stated. The two villages mentioned are situated in the extreme northeastern corner of Salvador. As they are a considerable distance from Matagalpa, it is best, perhaps, to consider the language spoken in them as a subdialect of Matagalpa proper.

Mangue

(*Synonym:* Choluteca)

Extending along the Pacific coast from the Bay of Fonseca in Honduras to the Gulf of Nicoya in Costa Rica, and living between the lakes and the ocean, were several small tribes belonging to different linguistic stocks: three—Mangue, Dirian, Orotinan—to the Chiapanecan; one—Niquiran—to the Nahuatlan; and another—Subtiaban—forming an independent family.

Mangue, or Choluteca, as Squier designated it, a Chiapanecan dialect, was the most northwesterly tribe of the series, the area occupied extending, according to this writer (**3** : II, 310), northward from the

territory of the Subtiaba (Squier's Nagrandans) "along the Gulf of Fonseca into what is now Honduras." The distance it extended into the interior of this territory is not given, but it has been carried on the map in this direction to the southern boundary of the Lencan territory, though it must be admitted that the data on this point are exceedingly meager and unsatisfactory. In locating the tribes formerly dwelling along the Pacific coast of Nicaragua we have the benefit of Doctor Berendt's statements in his address (**2**: 132–145), which agree very closely with Squier's conclusion, though neither indicates the extent into the interior, except where limited by the lakes. Gomara (**1**: 264; **2**: 457) and Herrera mention a tribe (the Corobici) which seems to be identical with the Mangue (or Chorotega). The latter author says (II, dec. 3, 121), "Hablaban en Nicaragua cinco Lenguas diferentes, Coribici, que lo hablan mucho en Chuloteca," etc. Nevertheless, Peralta thinks the Coribici were the ancestors of the Guatuso (see below). It would seem that Mangue is a comprehensive term precisely equivalent to Chorotega, properly used, that is, to include the Chiapanecan element in this region—Choluteca, Dirian, and Orotinan. However, as Squier (**3**: 311–312) has created confusion in the use of the terms Chorotegan and Cholutecan, it is best to follow Brinton in restoring the old term Mangue to supersede Choluteca.

Subtiaban

(*Synonyms:* Nagrandan, Maribi)

This language, which forms a distinct family known by the same name, is the same as Squier's Nagrandan and Berendt's Maribi. The territory throughout which it was spoken is described by Squier (**3**: 310) as "the Plain of León, or district between the northern extremity of Lake Managua and the Pacific;" this probably included the greater portion of the district of León. As the same author states in another place, it was bounded on the northwest by the territory of the Choluteca or Mangue. This language, which, judging by Sapper's map (**1**) is not yet entirely extinct, though Sapper gives no vocabulary, is generally conceded by philologists to be not connected with any known family, and the vocabulary furnished by Squier (**3**) appears to justify this conclusion, notwithstanding a slight resemblance to the Dorasque on the one hand and to the Matagalpan on the other.

Dirian

This language, which belongs to the Chiapanecan family, was spoken by the people who formerly occupied the territory between the upper extremity of Lake Nicaragua, the river Tipitapa, and the southern half of Lake Managua and the Pacific. Their principal

towns were situated where now stand the cities of Granada, Masaya, and Managua, and the villages of Tipitapa, Diriomo, and Diriamba. (Squier, **3**:310). They are supposed to be now extinct. The name Dirian signifies "people of the hills."

NIQUIRAN

This language, which belongs to the Nahuatlan family, and is closely related to Pipil and Aztec, was spoken by a colony probably from the Pipil group of Salvador and Guatemala. The area occupied was the narrow strip between Lake Nicaragua and the Pacific Ocean, and the neighboring islands of the lake. The fact that these Indians belonged to the "Mexican" (Nahuatlan) stock was noticed by Oviedo, who applied to them the name Niquirans. Even the short vocabulary given by Squier makes the relation clear, showing that the people now under consideration pertained to the Aztec group and were closely related to the Pipil.

OROTINAN

This third Chiapanecan dialect of the southern section was spoken throughout an area in northwestern Costa Rica extending from the southern shore of Lake Nicaragua southward to and along both shores of the Gulf of Nicoya for the greater part of its length, and westward to the Pacific Ocean. Squier (**3**:310) says merely, "occupying the country around the Gulf of Nicoya, and to the southward of Lake Nicaragua." Brasseur de Bourbourg (**1**:II, 110) says the Orotinas in the vicinity of the Gulf of Nicoya have as their principal villages Nicoya, Orotina, Cantren, and Chorote. Oviedo (IV, 108) also locates them about the Gulf of Nicoya. Peralta (**1**:720) gives the river Barranca as their southern limit on the east side of the gulf. Fernandez (**1**:548) gives the latitude of the city of Punta Arenas as their southern limit on the east coast, agreeing closely in this respect with Peralta's conclusion.

The writer has no vocabulary of this particular colony, but from their discovery by the Spaniards in the sixteenth century history speaks of them as "Chorotegans," thus connecting them with the Mangue and Dirian tribes. Additional remarks on this tribe will be made in treating of the peoples of Costa Rica.

ULVA

(*Synonym:* Sumo)

As the data at hand are too meager to justify an attempt to indicate on the map the limits of the tribal areas of the Ulvan family, now to be dealt with, it seems best to give only the boundaries of

the area occupied by the entire family, indicating the tribal or subtribal names at such points therein as, from the best evidence accessible, appear to have been occupied by them respectively. The fact must be borne in mind, however, that the very existence of some of these tribes or subtribes is disputed.

After comparing what is said by Squier and other authorities on the subject, Brinton, the principal authority here followed in the classification of the Ulvan tribes, gives (**3**: 162–163) the following with their respective habitats:

> Carchas, or Cukras, on the Rio Mico, above the Matlack Falls.
> Cocos, on the Rio Coco (Segovia).
> Melchoras, on the Rio de los Ramas (Bluefields).
> Micos, on the Rio Mico.
> Pantasmas, in the upper basin of the Rio Coco.
> Parrastahs, on the Rio Mico.
> Siquias, on the upper Rio Mico.
> Subironas, on the Rio Coco.
> Taocas, or Twakas, at San Blas, on the Rio Twaka.
> Ulvas (Woolwas or Smoos), on the headwaters of the Bluefields river.

It must be added, however, that Brinton does not furnish his authority for some of these names and localities, and that Sapper (**1**: 29) seems to doubt the correctness of his list and peoples the areas very largely with the Sumo. He says:

> The Sumos are mentioned by Brinton under the name Ulvas; aside from the Indians given as Bulbuls, Carchas, Cocos, Micos, Parrastahs, Pantasmas, Melchoras, Siquias, Smoos, Subironas, Twakas, and Woolwas, all however seem to belong to the Sumos.

Squier and other authorities mention the Twaka, Cukra, and Ulva; and Reclus (283) names in addition the Pantasma, Melchora, Siquia, and Laman. The last-named author locates on his map most of the names he gives, but not consistently with his text. Bell (**1**: 242–268) mentions the following tribes: The Smoos, "the most numerous tribe," on the headwaters of all the rivers from Bluefields to Patook [Patuca]; the Twaka, "a tribe of Smoos," along the Twaka river, a branch of the Prinz Awala; the Toongla, along the other branch of the same river—a mixed race of Smoos and Mosquito Indians; the Cookra, around Bluefields.

Young (80) says the principal residence of the Twaka at that time was about the head of the Patuca river. Squier (**4**) locates them, on his map, on the middle section of Segovia river, which forms in part the boundary line between Honduras and Nicaragua. Reclus (261) makes the tribe a member of the Lenca group and locates them on the upper affluents of the Patuca river.

As before noted, Brinton locates the Cookra (Cukra, Carcha) on the Rio Mico above Matlack Falls. According to Squier's map, the Mico is the same as the Bluefields river, which has received also the name Escondido, and was by the Indians called Lama and Siguia, the latter name referring probably only to a tributary. Squier places the

Cukra in the interior, midway between the Bluefields and Segovia rivers. Reclus (283) locates them well up the Segovia river. This author, however, gives the Carca as a different tribe.

As has been seen, Brinton places the Ulva (Ulua, Woolwa, Walwa, Smoos, Sumo) on the headwaters of the Bluefields river; Squier, on the middle course of the same river. Squier locates the Melchora immediately east of the southern end of Lake Nicaragua. The name Sumo (or Smoos) appears to be used rather indefinitely, but more generally as an equivalent of the stock name (Ulvan), the people embraced being considered as properly forming but one tribe, and the above-named supposed tribes as mere minor and local subdivisions. It is probable that the Ulvan dialects were related to Chibcha, but for the present it has been thought best to keep them distinct.

Rama

As stated by Brinton and Sapper, the Indians speaking this language are restricted at present to a small island in the Bluefields lagoon, and were confined to the same island at the time Bell lived in the Mosquito territory (1846–1862). There is evidence, however, that formerly they occupied a much larger area on the neighboring mainland, but whether this region lay along the Bluefields river or farther south it is impossible to decide with certainty from the meager data obtainable. Bell (259) says:

> The Ramas inhabit a small island at the southern extremity of Blewfields lagoon. They are only a miserable remnant of a numerous tribe that formerly lived on the St. Johns and other rivers in that neighborhood. A great number of them still live at the head of the Rio Frio, which runs into the St. Johns river [Rio San Juan] at San Carlos fort.

Those at the head of the Rio Frio, Costa Rica, are without doubt the Guatuso.

Squier (**4**: 366) locates them between the Bluefields and San Juan rivers, indicating, as does Bell, a former more southerly habitat. This conclusion agrees with the indications furnished by the very brief vocabulary of the language which has been obtained, and which shows slight affinity with the Talamancan dialects, but a closer relation with those of the Doraskean group of the Chibchan family. Following Brinton, the writer has associated it with the latter. Bell's supposition that the Rama are identical with the people living on the Rio Frio, Costa Rica—that is to say, with the Guatuso—is, however, an error, as appears from comparison of the languages of the two peoples and from the great difference in their characteristics so far as known, although both belong to the Chibchan stock.

Mosquito

The mixed race designated by this name inhabits the Gulf coast of Honduras and Nicaragua from Cape Gracias southward to a point

about midway between Bluefields and San Juan rivers, extending but a comparatively short distance toward the interior, except along the banks of some of the larger rivers. The statements of writers of some years ago in regard to the extent of country occupied by these Indians must be received with some reserve, being more or less warped by their relations with the contending governments. Even Squier must be included in this class. It is unnecessary to quote here the statements referred to. It may be stated, however, that Pittier (9), judging by the local names, is of the opinion that in the past people of this race occupied the coast of Costa Rica from San Juan river to Chiriqui lagoon. In the present paper Sapper is followed as to the area embraced in the Mosquito territory.

The language is considered distinct. Lucien Adam, who has studied its grammatical construction, decides that it can not be brought into relation with either the Caribbean or the Chibchan stock. Notwithstanding this high authority, the writer is inclined to accept the traditional, or perhaps it may be said the semihistorical, assertion that the primary element of the mixture was Carib. That the language contains Carib elements, whether borrowed or not, soon becomes evident on comparison.

General Remarks on the Tribes of Costa Rica

Continuing the investigation southward, Costa Rica next engages attention. On account of its bearing on the determination of the boundaries of the areas throughout which other dialects were spoken, it is necessary to refer again to Orotina,[1] already noticed (see p. 78), in order to fix more definitely the eastern and southeastern boundary of the area throughout which it was spoken. As already stated (p. 78), Peralta appears to give the Barranca river, which enters the Gulf of Nicoya on the eastern side, near the city of Punta Arenas, as the southeastern boundary. Fernandez (**1**:548) asserts it was proven that Orotina was a generic speech applicable to all the Gulf region of Nicoya. He says also (**1**:35, note *b*), in commenting on the Relación of Andrés de Cereceda, who accompanied Gil Gonzales de Avila (about 1522) on his expedition northward along the western coast, that the Orotina occupied the coast (on the eastern side of the gulf) between the rivers Aranjuez and Chomes (Guasimal). These are two small rivers, but a few miles apart, which enter the gulf on the eastern side a short distance north of Rio Barranca. Fernandez thus locates their southern boundary substantially at the same point as that indicated by Peralta.

The northern and western limits, however, are not so definitely given.

[1] Orotina: Sn. Urutina, Gurutina, Nicoya. The name Nicoya was seldom used as referring to the people or language, but was used interchangeably with Orotina as referring to the gulf, and sometimes to the surrounding regions occupied by the Orotina.

Peralta (**1**: 720) says their seat was north of the Rio Barranca and southeast from the Rio Zapandi (or Tempisque), the river which flows south and enters the Gulf of Nicoya at its extreme northwestern point. But the statement of Fernandez given above includes the western peninsula, as does that of Brasseur de Bourbourg, mentioned in the first reference to the Orotina. Oviedo (III, 111) says, "The Indians of Nicoya and Orosi are of the language of the Chorotegas." This apparently includes the area now embraced in the district of Guanacaste, which includes the peninsula, and is probably what Squier based his conclusion on, the word "Chorotegas" being used here in a generic sense, and hence including the Orotina. Peralta says (**1**: 806, note) that in Nicoya (the peninsula) the Orotinan language was spoken, as conjectured by Orozco y Berra, following Oviedo and Torquemada. The data seem to justify, therefore, outlining the Orotinan area as on the accompanying map.

It appears from a later paper by Peralta, however, that he includes as Orotinan territory the area now embraced in the district of Guanacaste as marked on the writer's map. This paper was prepared by Peralta as part of his report as commissioner of Costa Rica to the Columbian Historical Exposition at Madrid in 1892. Not having access to the original paper, the writer here quotes from the extract given by Doctor Brinton (**5**: 40–42), one of the commissioners of the United States to that exposition. As Peralta's paper bears on the ethnography of the entire territory of Costa Rica, the portion relating to the ethnographic distribution is quoted in full for the purpose of further reference:

> On the shores of the Pacific, in the peninsula of Nicoya, in all that territory which now constitutes the province of Guanacaste, and embracing all the vicinity of the gulf of Nicoya to the point of Herradura, lived the Chorotegas or Mangues, divided into various tribes or chieftancies, feudataries of the Cacique of Nicoya, to wit, Diria, Cangen, Zapanci, Pococi, Paro, Orotina, and Chorotega, properly so called, in the valley of the Rio Grande. By the side of these dwelt the immigrant Nahoas, who carried this far the arts and traditions of the Aztecs, and the cultivation of cacao, and obtained a supremacy over the previous inhabitants. The Chorotegas spoke the language of the same name, or the Mangue, a branch, if not the trunk and origin, of the Chiapanec. . . . The Nahuas, whose most important colonies controlled the isthmus of Rivas between Lake Nicaragua and the Pacific, were established in Nicoya and spoke the Mexican or Nahuatl language.
>
> A Mexican colony also existed in the valley of Telorio (valley of the Duy, or of the Mexicans) near the Bay del Almirante, and inhabited the island of Tojar, or Zorobaro (now of Columbus), and the towns of Chicaua, Moyaua, Quequexque, and Corotapa, on the mainland, this being the farthest eastward in Costa Rica, or in Central America, to which the Nahuas reached, so far as existing evidence proves.
>
> Between the Lake of Nicaragua and the gulf of Nicoya, to the east of the volcano of Orosi and the river Tempisque, near longitude 85° west of Greenwich, dwelt the mysterious nation of the Corobicies, or Corbesies, ancestors of the existing Guatusos. To the east of the same meridian were the Votos, occupying the southern shores of the Rio San Juan to the valley of the Sarapiqui.

To the east of the Sarapiqui, and from the mouths of the San Juan on the Atlantic to the mouth of the river Matina, was the important province of Suerre, belonging to the Guetars, who occupied the ground to Turrialba and Atirro, in the valleys of the Reventazon and the river Suerre or Pacuar.

Between the river Natina and the river Tarire were the provinces of Pococi and of the Tariacas. To the east of the Tarire to the Bay del Almirante, dwelt the Viceitas, Cabecares, and Terrabas (Terrebes, Terbis, or Tiribies).

On the Bay del Almirante to Point Sorobeta or Terbi there was the Chichimec colony, already referred to, whose cacique Iztolin conversed in the Mexican language with Juan Vasquez de Coronado in 1564.

The Changuenes occupied the forests about the headwaters of the Rio Ravalo.

The Doraces, south of the Laguna of Chiriqui, and at the foot of the Cordillera, adjoined in the valley of the river Cricamola or Guaymi with the warlike nation of the latter name.

The Guaymies occupied the coast and the interior lands situated between the rivers Guaymi and Conception, of Veragua.

In front of the valley of the Guaymi lies the Island del Escodo, the governmental limit of Costa Rica; so that the Guaymis were distributed in nearly equal parts between the jurisdiction of Costa Rica and of Veragua.

In the interior, in the highlands about Cartago, on the slopes both of the Atlantic and the Pacific, were the provinces Guarco, Toyopan, and Aserri; farther west, toward the gulf of Nicoya, Pacaca, Garabito, and Chomes adjoined along the summits of La Herradura and Tilaran with the Chorotegas.

These provinces formed the territory of the Huetares, or Guetares, *uei tlalli*, in Nahuatl, "great land," a general term, which included various tribes and chieftancies of the same linguistic stock, one entirely diverse from those of the neighboring Mangues and Nahuas, toward whom they were unfriendly, although maintaining commercial relations.

The province of Guarco was considered by both the natives and the Spaniards as one of the most favored localities in the country, and for that reason was selected by the Guetares, and later by the whites, as the site of their principal town. It was here that the city of Costa Rica was founded in 1568. The name is a corruption of the Nahuatl Qualcan, from "qualli," good, convenient, with the locative suffix "can." Qualcan means, therefore, "good place," or, as it is translated in Molina's Vocabulary, "a well-sheltered and desirable place," which answers well to the valley of Cartago.

Southeast of Chorotega and the heights of Herradura, and south of the Guetares, extending to the Pacific Ocean, between the rivers Pirris and Grande of Terraba, was the province of the Quepos, of which the Spanish Government formed the district of Quepo, whose extreme limit toward the southeast was the old Chiriqui River.

According to the most probable conjectures, the Quepos belonged to the family of the Guetares and lived, by preference, on the coasts. They were also enemies of the Mangues and the Cotos and Borucas, and in consequence of their wars with them and with the whites, and with the burden of labors laid upon them by the latter, their towns disappeared in the middle of the eighteenth century without leaving any positive traces which will enlighten us upon their origin.

Adjoining the Quepos, the Cotos or Coctos occupied the upper valley of the river Terraba, formerly known as the Coto.

These formed a numerous and warlike tribe, skillful in both offense and defense.

They are not known in Costa Rica by this name; but there is no doubt that the Borucas are their descendants. These Borucas occupied the region about Golfo Dulce, formerly the gulf of Osa, east of the river Terraba, and gave their name Buricas, Burucas, or Bruncas to the province of Borica, discovered by the Licentiate Espinosa in the first voyage of exploration made by the Spaniards to this region in 1519, and also to Point Burica, the extreme southern limit of Costa Rica, in latitude 8° north.

The province of Burica extended toward the east to the Llanos of Chiriqui, and formed a part of the government of Quepo. It belongs today to the district of Punta Arenas.

The Terrabas, who have given their name to the river formerly called the Coto, do not belong to the tribes of the Pacific Slope. They were brought to the location there, which they now occupy, in Aldea or Terraba, partly by the persuasion of the missionaries, partly by force, having been obliged to abandon the rough mountains to the north about the headwaters of the Tilorio or Rio de la Estrella, the Yurquin, and the Rovalo, about the year 1697. They have been variously called Terbis, Terrebes, Terrabas, and Tirribies, but there are no differences of dialect between them and their relatives to the north, other than would necessarily take place in any tongue from a separation of this length.

At the time of the Conquest, therefore, the tribes occupying the territory of Costa Rica were Nahuas, Mangues, Guetares, Viceitas, Terrabas, Changuenes, Guaymies, Quepos, Cotos, and Borucas.

. . . It is almost impossible to determine the ethnic affinities of the Guetares as long as no vocabularies of their tongue can be found, though such were certainly written by such able linguists as Fray Pedro de Betanzos, Fray Lorenzo de Bienvenida, Fray Juan Babtista, and other Franciscans, who founded missionary establishments and taught the natives around Cartago; but the testimony of archaeology proves that if they were not related to the Nahuas, they were subject to their influence, perhaps through the active commerce they had with the Chorotegas and Nahuas about the gulf of Nicoya.

. . . As to the Guaymies, Terrabas, Changuenes, and Borucas, their affinities to the tribes to the east of them are well marked, and it would not be surprising if they were also closely related to the natives between Paria and Darien, and even with the Chibchas of Colombia, as has been maintained by Brinton.

Guatuso

The eastern and western boundaries of the Guatusan area on the map are based largely on inference, rather than on positive evidence. That the tribe occupied the valley of the Rio Frio to the San Juan river, and the region about the headwaters of the former, is the general consensus of the authorities. There is some evidence also that they frequently wandered down the San Carlos river, and Carl Sapper (**1** : 31) speaks of a small body on a branch of the Sarapiqui. Gabb (483) states merely that at the time of his visit—

> They occupy a part of the broad plains north and east of the high volcanic chain of North-Western Costa Rica and south of the great lake of Nicaragua, especially about the headwaters of the Rio Frio.

Fernandez (**3**:676) says:

> The lands occupied by the Guatusos are very extensive, level, fertile, and intersected by navigable rivers, with a slight incline from the right bank of the San Juan river to the Central Cordillera, which divides the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific.

Bishop Thiel (**2** : 12) says they live dispersed in the skirts of the Cerro Pelado, of the Tenorio, and on the banks of the affluents of the Rio Frio, principally between the Pataste, the Muerte, the Cucaracha, and the Venado. He appears to have succeeded in obtaining a vocabulary of their language, judging from that given in his Apuntes

Lexicograficos. As indicating the southern boundary may be cited the statement by Gabb (484) that the town of San Ramon is "not far from the borders of the Guatuso country." Attention is directed likewise to what is said of this tribe by Peralta in the extract from his paper given above.

As will be seen by reference to the List of Families and Tribes on the map, the writer has followed the philologists in placing the Guatusan dialect in the Chibchan family. This relation appears to be borne out by the vocabularies, though not to a very marked extent.

GUETARE

(*Synonym:* Huetare)

Doctor Brinton (**3 : 146**) at first associated this idiom with the Chiapanecan linguistic stock, but afterward (**4: 498**) decided from material which had come into his possession that it pertained to the Talamancan linguistic group. While it is very probable that Doctor Brinton is correct in his later conclusion, which is here followed, the evidence he presents is not entirely satisfactory. This consists in the comparison of very brief vocabularies, as follows:

	GUETARE	OTHER TALAMANCAN DIALECTS
man	*pejelilli*	*pejettillé*=vir.
woman	*palacrak*	*palacrak*
sun	*cagune*	*cagune*
moon	*furia*	*tura*
fire	*yocó*	*yocó*
water	*dicre*	*dicre*
head	*sotacii*	*sotacu*
eye	*seguebra*	*seguebra*, or *wobra*
ear	*secuque*	*zgo-ku*
mouth	*sequeque*	*ko-kwu*
nose	*seyiquete*	*jik*
tongue	*sequecte*	[1] *kok-tu*
tooth	*saka*	*ka*
hand	*seyura*	*ura*
foot	*ecuru*	*kru-kwe*
house	*tu*	*hu*

The agreement between the two idioms, as shown by these brief lists, is so close that they may be considered as one and the same language. In other words, the evidence proves too much in view of the fact that the Guetare vocabulary, which was obtained by Doctor Berendt, was marked by him "Ancient Talamanca," and not Guetare. Moreover, this was obtained about forty-four years ago from some natives residing near San José de Costa Rica, but not a word, it seems, was said in regard to their relation to the Guetare tribe. Doctor Brinton adds, "It is called Talamanca, but Mr. Gabb,

[1] From Gabb.

who saw it, pronounced it to be of a different dialect." The real evidence, therefore, is limited to the fact that the vocabulary was obtained from Indians living in the region formerly embraced in the Guetare territory. It is deemed safest, however, to include the idiom for the present in the Talamancan group.

Although it is difficult at this late day to mark the boundaries of the Guetare territory as they existed at the time of the Spanish conquest, the area in a general sense is readily determined from historical and other data.

Oviedo (lib. 29, cap. 21) says—

> Los Güetares son mucha gente, é viven ençima de las sierras del puerto de La Herradura, é se extienden por la costa deste golpho [Nicoya] al Poniente de la banda del Norte hasta el confin de los Chorotegas.

According to this statement, the territory of the tribe reached the Pacific coast and extended along it toward the northwest to Punta Arenas or Rio Barranca, the limit, as stated above, of the southern extension of the Orotina, or "Chorotegas" as Oviedo terms them. As the tribe extended back into the sierras behind Herradura bay, their territory must have embraced the Sierras de Turrubales, as stated by Fernandez (**1**: 34, note *f*).

Peralta (**1**: 768–769) mentions several provinces which, he says, were peopled by the Indians of this tribe, as follows:

> Garabito, Catapa, Tice, and Boto (Voto), comprehending the territory south of Lake Nicaragua and San Juan river to its confluence with the Rio Sarapiqui (south) to the mountains of Barba. Including the valley of Coyoche between the rivers Barranca and Grande; Abra (or Curriravo, Curridabat) and Tayopan; Accerri and Pacaca. Guarco, between the rivers Taras and Toyogres. Turriarba (or Turrialba) and Cooc (or Cot). The aborigines of these provinces were Guetares.

This includes the Boto, or Voto, Indians in the Guetare group, who, Peralta says (**1**: 401), were situated on the right margin of the Desaguadero (San Juan) between the Frio, Pocosol, and Sarapiqui rivers. Adding the province of Suerre, as he does in the extract given above, would make the San Juan river from its mouth up to the Rio Frio the northern boundary of the Guetare territory. As the mountains of Barba are in the district of Heredia and those of Turrialba are along the northern boundary of the district of Cartago, this description applies to a wide strip extending from the San Juan river on the north and the Caribbean sea on the northeast, to the Pacific ocean on the south, the coast line on the south reaching from Barranca river at the northwest probably to, or nearly to, the Rio Grande de Terraba on the southeast.

Fernandez (**1**: 587), quoting from Licenciado Cavallon, seems to include the district of Cartago in the Guetare territory. In regard to the seat of the Voto tribe or subtribe, he says (**1**: 64, note *e*):

> Boto or Voto includes the Indians who occupied the southern cordillera of Costa Rica from the river of Barva up to the Rio de Orosí, called Sierra de Tilaran. The name is preserved in that of the Volcano de los Votos or de Puas.

The Sierra de Tilaran, as marked on the map of Costa Rica, extends along the extreme northwestern border of the district of Alajuela, while the volcano of Puas (or Poas) is on the extreme eastern border, where it joins the district of Heredia. That the Sierra de Tilaran formed the extreme southern boundary of the Guatusan territory is certain. In fact, one portion of it is named the Cerro de los Guatusos. It seems, therefore, that the range to which Fernandez refers is that which extends east and west across Heredia and the southeastern portion of Alajuela; but what stream is referred to by the name "Barva" is uncertain (possibly it should be "Brava," though this does not solve the difficulty with the limited data at hand).

The statement made by Peralta in the excerpt from his pen on page 83 agrees with his conclusion, as stated above. The assertion that "to the east of the Sarapiqui, and from the mouths of the San Juan on the Atlantic to the mouth of the river Matina, was the important province of Suerre, belonging to the Guetars," is open to question, however, as there is no means of comparing the languages. Nevertheless, the writer has followed Peralta in the accompanying map.

Voto

(*Synonym:* Boto)

According to all the evidence remaining on record, this tribe occupied the country south of the Rio San Juan from the river San Carlos to the Sarapiqui, their territory extending southward to, and probably across, the district of Heredia and the southern part of Alajuela.

The writer has failed to find the data on which Peralta and others base the conclusion that the people of this tribe were connected with the Guetare. Carl Sapper (1: 31) speaks of them as a distinct tribe, although not alluding to their ethnic relations. As no vocabulary, not even a few words of their language, has been preserved, so far as known, its affinities can be only guessed at or inferred from other data. Is it not possible that they were the Rama, part of whom Bell mistook for the Guatuso. (See p. 80.) If his statement was based on some tradition, the supposition may not be wholly gratuitous; otherwise it is. On the whole it is considered best for the present to follow here the Costa Rican authorities, who are on the ground and familiar with the history of their country so far as recorded; hence the Voto are assigned to the Guetare territory, although not referred to on the map.

Suerre(?)

It is doubtful whether the territory included under this name should be considered a separate linguistic area. In the extract

given above (p. 83) from Peralta's paper on the ethnography of Costa Rica, and in his work heretofore cited (**1**: 769, note 1), he says:

> To the east of the Sarapiqui, and from the mouths of the San Juan on the Atlantic to the mouth of the river Matina, was the important province of Suerre, belonging to the Guetars, who occupied the ground to Turrialba and Atirro, in the valleys of the Reventazon and the river Suerre or Pacuar.

The chief evidence of the relation of the people of this province to the Guetare is found in the letter of Juan Vasquez de Coronado (December 11, 1562, given by Peralta, **1**: 760–765) where, referring to the expedition of Cavallon and the submission of the provinces of the Guetare, he mentions the provinces of Suerre and Turucaca, the former on the Sea of the North and the latter on the Sea of the South (764).

The name is not referred to on the accompanying map.

Quepo(?)

The same uncertainty as to linguistic distinction exists in regard to the people occupying the section known under this name as in the case of the Suerre.

Peralta (**1**: 769, note 2) says Quepo was "a province south of the Cordillera de la Candelaria, upon the Pacific Ocean, at 9° 30′ north latitude." In the extract from his paper, given above, he locates them southeast of Chorotega and the heights of Herradura, and south of the Guetare, extending to the Pacific ocean between the rivers Pirris and Grande of Terraba. He adds further that, according to the most probable conjectures, the Quepo belonged to the family of the Guetare, and that they were the enemies of the Coto and the Boruca.

These statements, when closely compared with those of the same author in what precedes, show some confusion; moreover, for reasons which will appear further on, the writer is not prepared to accept the statement that the Guetare (the Quepo being included) extended southeast to the Rio Grande de la Terraba, as the valley of this river, in part at least, was occupied by the Terraba and the Boruca. It is not indicated on the map.

Talamanca

It has been found most convenient for present purposes, and not inconsistent with correct classification, to retain the name Talamanca for that group of closely allied dialects spoken by certain tribes of Indians inhabiting both sides of the cordillera in eastern and southeastern Costa Rica. These dialects, which belong to the Chibchan family, are known by the following names: Boruca, Bribri,

Cabecar, Estrella, Terraba, Tirribi, and Tucurric; some others are mentioned which are now extinct. This course has been adopted for present purposes, for the reason that, while it is possible to outline with approximate correctness the territory of the group, the data do not justify the attempt to mark the areas of the separate dialects.

It is necessary to state here that on the present map the southeastern boundary of Costa Rica, that between this republic and Panama, is not as given on most maps, but as defined by the President of France, who was appointed arbiter by the two republics of the dispute concerning this boundary. By this decision a considerable strip of southeastern Costa Rica was awarded to Colombia. As will be seen, part of the Talamancan territory falls within this strip. It should be stated further that Talamanca is here used as a generic term for the group and not given to any one dialect. The name has been very loosely applied; for instance Fernandez (1: 617) says the "naciones" of the Talamanca are Cabecar, Viceite, Terraba, Toxare, Changuene, Zegua, Torasque, and Guaymie, thus including tribes of two different stocks—Chibchan and Nahuatlan (Zegua). It is somewhat strange that a citizen of the country should have made this mistake in 1889, especially as Dr. Max Uhle in 1888 (470) gave correctly, so far as his reference extends, the Bribri, Cabecar, Estrella, Tiribi, and Tucurrique. Moreover, B. A. Thiel in his Apuntos Lexicograficos de las Lenguas, to which Fernandez refers, gives as the dialects of the Talamanca or Viceite, Bribri, Cabecar, Estrella, and Chirripo. He mentions Boruca and Terraba separately. Chirripo is considered by some authorities merely a subdialect of Cabecar; by others, Tariaca under another name, spoken by the people of a particular village called Chirripo and the immediately surrounding region. Sapper (1: 31) says:

> The language of Tucurrique or Tucurriqui, a village situated on the banks of the Rio Reventazon differs only in a few non-essential dialectic details from the language of the Indians living on the banks of the Rio Chirripo, Rio Estrella, Coen and the upper Teliri, which Pittier names Cabecara after their chief dwelling place, S. José Cabecar.

An examination of the vocabularies given by Thiel tends to confirm this conclusion. Pittier and Gagini (7) consider three of these dialects the principal ones—Bribri, to which are referred Cabecar, Chirripo, Estrella and Tucurric; Terraba, which is considered identical with Tirribi; and Boruca, which forms the third division.

According to Peralta's paper quoted above (p. 83), the southeastern boundary of the Guetare territory, where it joined the Talamancan area, extended from the mouth of the Rio Matina westward to Terrialba on the north line of Cartago district. In his map (Mitteilungen, 1901) Sapper locates a small colony of Cabecar in the northern part of this district, on the extreme headwaters of the Reventazon river. From this it appears that the northern boundary

of the Talamancan area ran slightly south of west from the mouth of the Rio Matina, nearly or quite to the middle of the northern boundary of Cartago district, where it turned south.

Notwithstanding the statement by Peralta given above, that the Guetare territory (including that of the Quepo) extended southeast to the Rio Grande Terraba, it is shown by Sapper's map that the Terraba and the Brunca (or Boruca) tribes are located, even at the present day, in the valley of this river, chiefly on the west side. The name of the river (Terraba) is also significant. It has been decided best, therefore, to include this river, or at least all except its headwaters, in the Talamancan territory. The Pacific ocean forms the southern boundary. It is apparent from Sapper's map that the eastern limit on the Pacific side can be but slightly east, if east at all, of Punta Boruca, as immediately to the east of it are encountered the Doraskean element. In the extract given Peralta evidently includes the Boruca peninsula in Doraskean territory. The eastern boundary of the Talamancan territory on the Pacific slope falls between the Boruca peninsula and the Rio Chiriqui Viejo.

The eastern boundary of the Talamancan territory, on the Atlantic slope, can not be exactly determined. That this territory did not include the Rio Rovalo, which falls into the western side of Chiriqui lagoon, seems certain; and that the Doraskean territory included some of the upper tributaries of the Telorio also seems certain. Pinart (2:1) says the Doraskean tribes were situated back of the Chiriqui lagoon, and from the name is inclined to believe their territory formerly extended north to the Changuinaula river, Changuina being a name sometimes applied to them. This condition of things, if correctly stated, must have prevailed, however, before the incoming of the Mexican colony. The line represented on the accompanying map does not extend quite so far north.

Tariaca(?).—Starting with that part of the territory belonging to the Atlantic slope and going south, the first tribe of which there is any notice is the Tariaca. This tribe is considered by Pittier (41) identical with the Chirripo of Thiel. The region occupied seems to have extended along the coast from the Rio Matina well down toward the Rio Teliri. Unless they were identical with the Chirripo the tribe is extinct and nothing is known of their language; but accepting Pittier's suggestion of identity with the Chirripo, as the writer is inclined to do, there is evidence in Thiel's vocabulary (1) that they belonged to the Talamancan group. Although Sapper (1: 32) appears to draw his information regarding the Tariaca from Pittier, he evidently distinguishes them from the Chirripo, as he says:

> North of the district of the Chirripo and Bribri Indians along the Atlantic coast are to be found the former dwelling places of the Tariaca (taken from Pittier) of which tribe nothing has been preserved to the present time.

It is probable that a remnant fleeing from Spanish attacks found refuge in the sierras, where from a local name they became known as Chirripo.

Cabecar.—Although in the statement quoted above Sapper implies that the Tariacan territory lay immediately north of and adjoining that of the Bribri Indians, in his map he places the Cabecar between the two tribes; that is to say, he locates them north of the Bribri territory. His map appears to be correct, as Gabb (487) says, "The Cabecars occupy the country from the frontiers of civilization to the western [left] side of the Coen branch of the Tiliri or Sicsola river." Pittier says merely that they occupy the valleys of the upper Coen, the middle branch of the Teliri (Teriri, or Sicsola).

Bribri.—According to Gabb (487) the Bribri occupied the region watered by the eastern branches of the Teliri, and also that about the mouths of this river; in other words, the region between the Coen on the west and the Changuinaula on the east.

Tirribi.—According to Gabb (487) and other authorities the Indians speaking this dialect occupied the region watered by the Rio Tilorio or upper Changuinaula.

Tucurric (*Cuqueri*).—Judging by the statements of Thiel (**1**:174), the early documents quoted by Fernandez (**1**:371, 610), and Gabb (486), the Indians speaking this dialect were located in the central part of what is now known as the Cartago district, on the headwaters of the Revantazon river.

Estrella.—Thiel gives a vocabulary of this idiom in his "Apuntes," but unfortunately omits to state where it was obtained. It is understood that the Indians speaking it lived in the valley of Estrella river, a stream entering the sea a short distance south of Limon, in the territory assigned to the Tariaca (or Chirripo). These appear to be the people spoken of by Gabb (492), who says:

> On the North or Estrella river, and on the Chiripo, there are a few more Cabecars who have little communication with the headquarters of the tribe, but who are in the habit of going out to Limon or Matina for what little trade they require.

As indicated by Thiel's vocabulary, the language is substantially identical with the Chirripo; in fact, no good reason appears for retaining the name as that of a different dialect.

Boruca (or *Brunca*).—Passing over the dividing range to the Pacific slope, we reach the territory where the other dialects of the Talamancan linguistic group were spoken. The chief one of these was Boruca, or Brunca. According to Sapper's map, those who still speak the language live in close relation with the Terraba, in the middle and lower parts of the valley of the Rio Grande de Terraba. Judging by local names and other data, it is probable that the territory of the Boruca in their palmy days extended eastward to and included the peninsula of Burica.

Terraba.—Terraba is at most merely a subdialect of the Tirribi and probably should not be considered as distinct therefrom. Gabb (487)

says "the Terrabas are tribally identical with the Tiribis." A tradition, which seems well authenticated, says that in the sixteenth century, through the influence of the Franciscan friars, a portion of the Tirribi was persuaded to break away and pass over to the Pacific slope. (Sapper and Gabb.)

Coto.—So far as known, no vocabulary of this dialect has been preserved; in fact, it is not positively known that there was such a dialect. As there is positive evidence, however, that there was a tribe known by this name which cannot be identified with any of those mentioned, one is justified in using the name as that of a distinct dialect or language. In the paper heretofore quoted (p. 83) Peralta says they occupied the upper valley of the Rio Terraba, formerly known as Coto river. He thinks there can be no doubt that the Boruca are their descendants.

This completes the list of the Talamancan dialects, none of which have been located on the map, but before passing to another group the following from Pittier's "Nombres Geograficos" is given in regard to the Bribri tribe, as throwing light on the tribal distinctions of the group.

The tribe was divided into two groups—the Tubor-uak, and the Kork-uak, or Djbar-uak. Marriage between persons of the same group or division was forbidden. Children belonged to the mother's clan. The clans or subdivisions of the groups were as follows:

tubor-uak[1]	*suritz-uak*	deer clan
	dutz-uak	bird clan
	bokir-uak	
	dojk-uak	
	sark-uak	monkey clan
	dogdi-uak	(river name)
	orori-uak	falls of the Arari river clan
	kugdi-uak	falls of the Uren river clan
	tkiut-uak	house-site clan
	duri-uak	broken clan
	arau-uak	*ara*, thunderclap; *u*, house
	urij-uak	ant-eating bear.
kork-uak	*djbar-uak*	
	diu-uak	

etc. (to 15 in number)

Gabb (487) states that there is no authority for the use of the name Beceita, or Veceita, frequently applied as a tribal name, and that it is unknown to the Indians of Costa Rica.

Sigua

(*Synonyms:* Xicagua, Chicagua, Chichagua, Segua, Shelaba (*Gabb*, 487), Mexicanos (*Fernandez*, **1**: 107)

That there was a Mexican or Nahuatlan colony on the northern coast of Costa Rica in the neighborhood of Chiriqui lagoon has been

[1] *Uak* signifies "pueblo" or "clan."

lately denied, but it is too clearly proven by historical evidence to admit of doubt. In the paper heretofore quoted Peralta says:

> On the Bay del Almirante [Chiriqui] to Point Sorobeta or Terbi there was the Chichimec colony, already referred to, whose cacique Iztolin conversed in the Mexican language with Juan Vasquez de Coronado in 1564.

A previous statement in the same paper is as follows:

> A Mexican colony also existed in the valley of Telorio near the Bay del Almirante, and inhabited the island of Tojar, or Zorobaro (now of Columbus), and the towns of Chicaua, Moyaua, Quequexque, and Corotapa, on the mainland.

The foregoing information enables us to locate on the map with approximate correctness the territory of this Nahuatlan colony, which marks the southern limit of this conquering race.

Doraskean Tribes [1]

According to all the authorities, the eastern boundary of the Talamancan area forms the western boundary of the Doraskean area. This area was in the form of a belt extending across this narrow part of the continent from the Chiriqui lagoon to the Pacific Ocean. In the extract from his paper heretofore given (p. 83) Peralta states that the "Changuenes," who belonged to this group—

> Occupied the forests about the headwaters of the Rio Ravalo. The Doraces, south of the Laguna of Chiriqui, and at the foot of the Cordillera adjoined in the valley of the river Cricamola or Guaymi with the warlike nation of the latter name.

Pinart (2:1) says the "Dorasque-Changuina" occupied the region about the volcano of Chiriqui, or Eneña, and the high sierras of Chiriqui and Talamanca, and that they adjoined the "naciones" of the Talamanca, extending northward to the Chiriqui lagoon. Sapper (1:map) shows them in the south near David bay and also in the sierras midway between that bay and Chiriqui lagoon. Except in the case of the two groups placed on his map, one of which at least he seems to have visited, the latter author relies chiefly on Pinart's statement. In addition to the statement above referred to, Pinart speaks of settlements at Bugava, which is near the Pacific coast at the Bay of David, and at Gualaca, which is in the interior about midway toward Chiriqui lagoon, around which Sapper locates his interior settlement. He mentions another group on the headwaters of the Changuinaula; others are mentioned at Calderas and Potrero, all of which, except those on the Changuinaula, he visited. He indicates that the former chief habitat of the "Dorasque-Changuina" was on the Atlantic slope, but that they were transferred by the missionaries in the eighteenth century to the Pacific slope.

Chaliva.—All ascertained in regard to this dialect is that it was spoken, or perhaps more correctly supposed to be or to have been

[1] On account of the comparatively small size of the map of the region now entered in the progress southward and the lack of data adequate for marking correctly the tribal areas, only the territory occupied by the group or subfamily is outlined.

spoken, by Indians living in the sierras about the headwaters of the Changuinaula. If the supposition that they speak a Doraskean dialect be correct, the fact tends to confirm Pinart's suggestion that the Changuina formerly occupied the valley of the Changuinaula, the river receiving its name, as Pittier (9) also says, from the Indians. The latter author, however, asserts that it is a Mosquito name.

Changuina.—All that is known in regard to the Indians speaking this dialect is that Pinart obtained his vocabulary from some three or four Changuina Indians living at Bugava on the Pacific side. Gabb (487) says it was reported to him that a part of the tribe still lived on the headwaters of the Changuinaula, but that "their very existence is known only by vague reports of their savage neighbors." It is possible that these were not Changuina but Talamanca Indians, otherwise they must be identified with the Chaliva.

Chumula.—Nothing is known in regard to this dialect except that information respecting it was obtained by Pinart from Indians living at Caldera and Potrero in the interior.

Dorask (proper).—The last Indian of this tribe died in 1882 (Pinart **2**:2). The vocabulary given by this author was taken from a manuscript of Padre Blas José Franco, obtained at Gualaca in the interior. Dorask (or Doracho, as sometimes written) does not appear to be a name mentioned by the early authors; at least Bancroft, who certainly made a careful examination of their writings (be our opinion of his conclusions what it may), says (III, 794), "The Tules, Dariens, Cholos, Dorachos, Savanerics, Cunas, and Bayamos are new names not mentioned by any of the older writers." What particular section the Dorask proper originally occupied is therefore unknown.

Gualaca.—Knowledge of this dialect rests on precisely the same evidence as that regarding the Dorask proper, namely, the vocabulary of Padre Blas José Franco as given by Pinart (**2**). It was obtained at the same place—Gualaca in the interior, where Sapper locates his interior group.

Teluskie(?)—This is given by Brinton (**3** : 175) as one of the dialects of his Changuina stock—here the Doraskean group. He gives as the locality, "near Rio Puan," a branch of Rio Telorio. The writer has been unable to find the authority on which this habitat is given, though he has access to all the works to which Bancroft refers in this connection. Pinart (**5**:118) merely mentions the name without particulars, nor is any vocabulary available. Possibly Teluskie is only another name for Chaliva.

GUAYMIE

This name is here used as employed by Pinart and Adam, that is, rather as designating a group, or subfamily, including several dialects, than as the name of a language. According to Pinart (**3**:2) there

were three principal dialects: The Move-Valiente, called also the Norteño by the Spaniards; the Murire-Bukueta, called also the Sabanero by the Spaniards; and the Muoi. Lucien Adam, however, counts six dialects, which he arranges in two groups, thus: 1, Muoi, Murire, and Sabanero; 2, Valiente, Guaymie, and Norteno.

The latter arrangement appears to be the correct one and that which Pinart has in reality followed in his vocabularies, notwithstanding his preliminary statement.

According to Pinart (**3**: preface), the group occupied at the time of the Conquest that part of the Panama district extending on the north from Chiriqui lagoon to Chagres river, and on the south, or Pacific side, from Chorrera to the Rio Fonseca; the Pearl and other islands of the Gulf of Panama, and Cebaco, Coiba, Jicaron, and other islands in the vicinity of Chiriqui lagoon. Peralta says in the paper heretofore quoted (p. 83) that "the Guaymies occupied the coast and the interior lands situated between the rivers Guaymi and Conception, of Veragua." According to Pinart (**3**:2) these dialects appear to be spoken at present only in the plains and sierras in the vicinity of the eastern end of Chiriqui lagoon, in the Valley Miranda (or Guaymie), and "en las sierras del mineral de Veraguas." He gives, however, at the end of his part 2, a list of the names of places, rivers, etc.—

Pertaining to the dialects of the Guaymie language, in the departments of Panama, Colon, Cocle, Veraguas, Los Santos and Chiriqui, and also in the comarcas of Balboa and Bocas-del-Toro.

The above territory extends to the Chagres river.

Sapper (**1**) very wisely has attempted to indicate on his map only the area of the Guaymie in the group sense. Even this is not marked on the present map, being included in the Doraskean area.

The linguistic material collected by Pinart has enabled philologists to assign these dialects to the Chibchan family with reasonable certainty. Adam is here followed in counting six dialects, and Pinart in fact gives six in his vocabularies.

Cuna

This language, which shows no clear affinity with any other language, in spite of certain leanings toward Chibchan, constitutes a stock in itself, to which the name Cunan is applied. Pinart was inclined to connect it with the Caribbean group, but this suggestion has not been accepted by philologists generally. The Cuna have been mentioned under various names, as Mandinga, Darien Indians, Chucunaque, Cunacuna, Bayano, Tule, Yule, San Blas Indians, etc., and the old Spanish name Cueva also refers to them.

According to Pinart (**1** : preface) the boundaries of the Cunan territory at the time of the Conquest were as follows: On the west a

line running from the Rio Chagres on the north coast to Chorrera on the Pacific coast; on the east and south it was separated from the Choco territory by the Rio Cacarica, the "sierra del Espiritu Santo," and the Rio Sambu. As the lines run from coast to coast, the region is easily indicated.

With Cuna end the languages of isthmian America on the south, the next language (Choco) being included geographically in the continent of South America.

ETHNIC DIVIDING LINE BETWEEN NORTH AMERICA AND SOUTH AMERICA

It has long been conceded that the linguistic element (if it may be termed so) of South America, at the time of the Spanish Conquest, extended into the southern sections of Central America. Brinton says (**3 : 164**):

> The mountain chain which separates Nicaragua from Costa Rica, and the headwaters of the Rio Frio from those of the more southern and eastern streams, is the ethnographic boundary of North America. Beyond it [going south] we come upon tribes whose linguistic affinities point towards the southern continent. Such are the Talamancas, Guaymies, Valientes, and others.

So far as the present writer is aware, however, Sapper (**1:48**) is the first to lay down definitely this dividing line on a map. Beginning at the extreme northwestern corner of Honduras, where it meets the bay, it runs thence southeast almost in a direct line to the eastern end of Lake Nicaragua; and thence in nearly the same direction to the head of the Gulf of Dulce on the southern coast of Costa Rica. This demarcation, allowing the following modification, is accepted: Carry the line from the east end, or near the east end, of Lake Nicaragua almost directly south to the mouth of the Gulf of Nicoya, the tribes east of this line—the Jicaque, Paya, the Ulvan tribes, Carib, Mosquito, Rama, and all the tribes of Costa Rica (except the Orotina), and those of Panama—being considered as belonging ethnically to the southern continent. Brinton's dividing line was laid down before he had discovered the correct relation of the Rama. He assigned the Jicaque, Paya, and Ulvan group to the northern continent, but, in the judgment of the writer, Sapper's division is the better one. On this point the only question in doubt is, whether or not the Xincan, Lencan, Matagalpan, and Subtiaban tribes, west of the dividing line thus drawn, should not also be added to the South American list.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahumada, Luis de. Carta del Padre Luis de Ahumada, dirigida al Padre Martin Pelaez, Provincial de la Compañia de Jesus el 13 de Noviembre de 1608. In Doc. Hist. Mex., 4th ser., vol. III. Mexico, 1857.

Albornoz, Juan de. Arte de la Lengua Chiapaneca [with] Doctrina Christiana by Luis Barrientos; Observations préliminaires by Alph. Pinart. Paris, 1875.

Alcedo, Antonio de. Diccionario Geográphico-Histórico. Vols. I–V. Madrid, 1786–1789.

Alegre, Francisco Javier. Historia de la Compañia de Jesus en Nueva España. Vols. I–III. México, 1841–42.

Alejandre, Marcelo. Cartillo Huasteca con su Gramática, Diccionario, y varias Reglas para aprender el Idioma. México, 1890.

Anales del Museo Michoacano. Morelia, 1887 et seq.

Anonymous. Vocabulario Castellano-Zapoteco (published by La Junta Colombina de Mexico). México, 1893.

Arlegui, Joseph de. Crónica de la Provincia de N. S. P. S. Francisco de Zacatecas. México, 1737.

Baegert, Jacob. An account of the aboriginal inhabitants of the California Peninsula, as given by Jacob Baegert. Translated and arranged by Charles Rau. In Smithsonian Rep. 1863, Washington, 1864; ibid., 1864, Washington, 1865.

Balbi, Adrien. Atlas ethnographique du Globe, ou Classification des Peuples anciens et modernes d'après leurs Langues. Paris, 1826.

Bancroft, Hubert Howe. The Native Races of the Pacific States. Vols. I–V. San Francisco, 1875–76.

Bell, Charles N. Remarks on the Mosquito Territory. In Jour. Roy. Geogr. Soc., vol. XXXII. London, 1862.

Belmar, Francisco. (1) Ensayo sobre la Langua Trike. (No author's name on title-page.) Small pamphlet. Oaxaca, 1897.

——— (2) Ligero Estudio sobre la Lengua Mazateca. (Pamphlet.) Oaxaca, 1892.

Berendt, C. H. (1) Report of Explorations in Central America. In Smithsonian Report for 1867. Washington, 1872.

——— (2) Geographical Distribution of the Ancient Central American Civilization. In Jour. Amer. Geogr. Soc. of New York, vol. 8. Also in Bol. Soc. Mex. Geogr. et Est., 1850 et seq. Two series. Vols. 1 and 2 entitled "Boletin del Instituto Nacional de Geografia y Estadistica." Reprint, (3d ed.) 1861.

Boyle, Frederick. A Ride across a Continent. Vols. I, II. London, 1868.

Brasseur de Bourbourg. (1) Histoire des Nations Civilisées du Mexique et de l'Amérique-Centrale. Vols. I–IV. Paris, 1857–1859.

——— (2) Popol Vuh. le Livre Sacré et les Mythes de l'Antiquité Américaine. Paris, 1861.

Brinton, Daniel G. (1) On the so-called Alaguilac Language of Guatemala. In Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc., vol. XXIV, and separate. Phila., 1887.

——— (2) On the Xinca Indians of Guatemala. In Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc., vol. XXI, and separate. Phila., 1884.

——— (3) The American Race. New York, 1891.

——— (4) The Ethnic Affinities of the Guetares of Costa Rica. In Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc., vol. XXXVI, and separate. Phila., 1898.

——— (5) Report upon the Collections Exhibited at the Columbian Historical Exposition. In Report of U. S. Commission to the Columbian Historical Exposition at Madrid, 1892–93. Washington, 1895.

Buelna, Eustaquio. Arte de la Lengua Cahita. 1 vol. México, 1891

Cancio, D. Lorenzo. (1) Noticias Sacadas de los Autos sobre la fuga que hicieron los Indios del pueblo de Suaqui. In Doc. Hist. Mex., 4th ser., vol. I. Mexico, 1856.

——— (2) Letter. Ibid., II, 1856.

Charencey, *Le Comte de.* Mélanges de Philologie et de Paléographie Américaines. Paris, 1883.

Charnay, Désiré. The Ancient Cities of the New World (translated from the French). New York, 1887.

Clavigero, D. Francesco Saverio. The History of Mexico. (English translation by Charles Cullen). Vols. I, II. London, 1787.

Cordova, Juan de. Arte del Idioma Zapoteco. (Reprint.) Morelia, 1886.

Documentos para la Historia de México. 4 series, 20 vols. Mexico, 1853–1857.

Escobar, Alonso de. Account of the Province of Vera Paz. In Jour. Roy. Geogr. Soc., vol. XI. London, 1841.

Fernández, León. (1) Historia de Costa Rica durante la Dominación Española. 1502–1821. Madrid, 1889.

——— (2) Lenguas Indigenas de Centro America en el Siglo XVIII. según copia del Archivo de Indias. San José de Costa Rica, 1892.

——— (3) The Guatuso Indians of Costa Rica. In Smithsonian Report for 1882. Washington, 1884.

Gabb, William M. On the Indian Tribes and Languages of Costa Rica. In Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc., vol. XIV. Phila., 1875.

Gage, Thomas. The English-American his travail by sea and land: or, a new survey of the West-India's. London, 1648.

Galindo, Juan. Description de la Rivière Usumasinta dans le Guatimala. In Nouv. Ann. Voy., vol. 63. Paris, 1834.

Garay, José de. Reconocimiento del Istmo de Tehuantepec. 1844.

Garcés, Francisco. Diario y derrotero. 1775–1776. In Doc. Hist. Mex., 2d ser., vol. I. Mexico, 1854.

García, Bartholomé. Manual para administrar los Santos Sacramentos. [n. p.] 1760.

Gatschet, Albert S. Classification into Seven Linguistic Stocks of Western Indian Dialects, contained in Forty Vocabularies. In Rep. U. S. Geogr. Surv. West of the 100th Meridian, vol. VII. Washington, 1879.

Gil, Hilarion Romero. Memoria. In Bol. Soc. Mex. Geogr. et Est., VIII. Mexico, 1860.

Gomara, Francisco Lopez de. Histoire Generalle des Indes Occidentales. Traduite en Francois par le S. de Genille Mart. Fumee. Paris, 1606.

Grasserie, Raoul de la. Langue Zoque et Langue Mixe; Grammaire, Dictionnaire, Textes traduits et analysés. Paris, 1898.

Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico. Bull. 30, pts. 1, 2, Bureau of American Ethnology. Washington, 1907–1910.

Hassel, G., *and* Cannabich, J. G. F. R. Vollständige und neueste Erdbeschreibung vom reiche Mexico, Guatemala und Westindien. Weimar, 1824.

Herrera, Antonio de. Historia General. 4 vols. Madrid, 1726–30.

Hervas, Lorenzo. Catálogo de las Lenguas de las Naciones Conocidas. Vol. 1: Lenguas y Naciones Americanas. Madrid, 1800.

Hewitt, J. N. B. H. Comparative Lexicology. In 17th Ann. Rept. Bur. Am. Eth., pt. 1, Washington, 1898.

Hrdlička, Aleš. (1) Notes on the Indians of Sonora, Mexico. In Am. Anthr. n.s. vol. VI. Lancaster, Pa., 1904.

——— (2) The region of the ancient "Chichimecs." Ibid., vol. V, 1903.

Icazbalceta, Joaquin García. Coleccion de Documentos para la Historia de México. Vols. I, II. México, 1858–66.

Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York. Vol. 8. New York, 1878.

Juarros, Domingo. (1) Compendio de la Historia de la Ciudad de Guatemala. Vols. I, II. Guatemala, 1808–1818.

——— (2) Also the English edition, entitled "A Statistical and Commercial History of the Kingdom of Guatemala." 1824.

KINO, E. F., KAPPUS, M. A., and MANGE, J. M. Itinerario. In Doc. Hist. Mex., 4th ser., vol. I. México, 1856.

LAET, IOANNES DE. Novus Orbis. Lugd, 1633.

LANDA, DIEGO DE. Relation des Choses de Yucatan. 1 vol. Paris, 1864.

LEÓN, NICOLÁS. (1) Introduccion [to the] Arte del Idioma Zapoteco por el P. Fr. Juan de Cordova. Morelia, 1886.

——— (2) Familias Lingüisticas de Mexico. Mexico, 1902.

LUDEWIG, HERMANN E. The Literature of American Aboriginal Languages. (In Trübner's Bibliotheca Glottica, I.) London, 1858.

LUMHOLTZ, CARL. The Huichol Indians of Mexico. In Bull. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist., vol. x, pp. 1–4. New York, 1898. (Also separate.)

LYON, G. F. Journal of a Residence and Tour in the Republic of Mexico. Vols. I, II. London, 1828.

MCGEE W J. The Seri Indians. In 17th Rep. Bur. Am. Ethnol., pt. 1. Washington, 1898.

MALER, TEOBERT. Researches in the Central Portion of the Usumatsintla Valley. In Mem. Peabody Mus., Harv. Univ., vol. 2, no. 1. Cambridge, 1901.

MAUDSLAY, ALFRED P. Exploration of the Ruins and Site of Copan, Central America. In Proc. Roy. Geogr. Soc., vol. VIII. London, 1886. (Also separate.)

MEMBREÑO, ALBERTO. Hondureñismos. Vocabulario de los Provincialismos de Honduras. Tegucigalpa, 1897.

MORFI, JUAN AGUSTIN DE. Viage de Indios y Diario del Nuevo-México. Part 4, 3d series, Doc. Hist. Mex., Mexico, 1856(?). (Also separate vol.)

MOTA PADILLA, MATIAS DE LA. Historia de la Conquista de la Provincia de la Nueva-Galicia. [1742.] Mexico, 1870.

MÜLLER, FREDERICK. Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft. Vol. II. Wien, 1882.

NOUVELLES ANNALES des Voyages. Vol. 63. Paris, 1834.

OROZCO Y BERRA, MANUEL. (1) Geografía de las Lenguas y Carta Etnográfica de México. México, 1864.

OROZCO Y BERRA, MANUEL. (2) Observaciones. In Bol. Soc. Mex. Geogr. Est., VIII, Mexico, 1860.

ORTEGA, JOSEPH DE. Vocabulario en Lengua Castellana y Cora. 1732. In Bol. Soc. Mex. Geogr. Est., 1st ser., vol. VIII, Mexico, 1860. (Also separate.)

OVIEDO Y VALDES, GONZALO FERNANDEZ DE. Historia General y Natural de las Indias. Vols. III, IV. Madrid, 1853–55.

PALACIO, DIEGO GARCÍA DE. Carta Dirijida al Rey de España, año 1576. Albany, 1860. No. 1 of Squier's Collection.

PERALTA, MANUEL M. DE. (1) Costa-Rica, Nicaragua y Panamá en el Siglo XVI. Madrid and Paris, 1883.

——— (2) On the Ethnology of Costa Rica. In Doctor Brinton's "Report upon the Collection Exhibited at the Columbian Historical Exposition at Madrid." Washington, 1895. See Brinton (5).

PIMENTEL, D. FRANCISCO. Cuadro descriptivo y comparativo de las Lenguas Indígenas de México. Vols. I, II. México, 1862–1865.

PINART, A. L. (1) Vocabulario Castellano-Cuna. Paris, 1890.

——— (2) Vocabulario Castellano-Dorasque, Dialectos Chumulu, Gualaca, y Changuina. Paris, 1890.

——— (3) Vocabulario Castellano-Guaymie, Dialectos Move-Valiente, Norteno y Guaymie-Penonomeno. Paris, 1892.

——— (4) Vocabulario Castellano-K'ak'-chi. Paris, 1897.

——— (5) Les Indiens de l'État de Panama. In Revue d'Ethnographie, VI, Paris, 1887.

PITTIER, H. Nombres Geographicos de Costa Rica. 1. Talamanca. San José de Costa Rica, 1895.

——— *and* GAGINI, C. Ensayo Lexicográfico sobre la Lengua de Térraba. San José de Costa Rica, 1892.

PLANCARTE, F. Los Tecos. In An. Mus. Michoacano. Año segunda. Morelia, 1889.

POWELL, JOHN WESLEY. Indian Linguistic Families. In Seventh Ann. Rep. Bur. Am. Ethn. Washington, 1891.

PRICHARD, JAMES COWLES. The Natural History of Man. Vol. II. London, 1855.

Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society. London, 1886.

Reclus, Élisée. The Earth and its Inhabitants—North America. Edited by A. H. Keane. Vol. II. New York, 1892.

Remesal, Antonio de. Historia de la Provincia de San Vicente de Chyapa. Madrid, 1619.

Ribas, Andres Perez de. Historia de los Triumphos de Nuestra Santa Fee. Madrid, 1645.

Rudo Ensayo, tentativa de una prevencional descripcion geographica de la provincia de Sonora. [Written about 1762.] San Augustin de la Florida, 1863.

Sahagun, Barnardino de. Histoire Générale des Choses de la Nouvelle-Espagne. Translated into French by D. Jourdanet and Rémi Siméon. Paris, 1880.

Sapper, Carl. (1) Beiträge zur Ethnographie des südlichen Mittelamerika. In Petermanns Mitteilungen, B. 47, H. 2, Gotha, 1901.

——— (2) Das Nördliche Mittel-Amerika. Braunschweig, 1897.

Scherzer, Karl. In Sitzb. Kais. Akad. Wissenschaften Philos.-Hist. Classe. B. 15. Wien, Jan., 1855.

Seler, Eduard. Notice sur les Langues Zapotèque et Mixtèque. Congrès International des Américanistes. Compte-Rendu. 8th sess. Paris, 1890.

Sevin, Ch. Journey to Mexico. In Jour. Roy. Geogr. Soc., vol. xxx. London, 1860.

Shufeldt, Robert W. Reports of Explorations. Ship-Canal by way of Tehuantepec. (42d Cong., 2d sess., Ex. Doc. 6.) Washington, 1872.

Squier, E. G. (1) A Visit to the Guajiquero Indians. In Harper's Magazine, New York, Oct., 1859.

——— (2) In Historical Magazine, vol. 4, no. 3, New York, 1860.

——— (3) Nicaragua: Its People, Scenery, Monuments, and the proposed Interoceanic Canal. 2 vols. New York, 1852. (Vol. 2 only referred to.)

——— (4) Notes on Central America; particularly the States of Honduras and San Salvador. 1 vol. New York, 1855.

Starr, Frederick. Notes upon the Ethnography of Southern Mexico. Reprinted from Proc. Davenport Acad. Nat. Sci., vol. VIII, 1900.

Stoll, Otto. (1) Die Sprache der Ixil-Indianer. Leipzig, 1887.

——— (2) Zur Ethnographie der Republik Guatemala. Zürich, 1884.

Tellechea, P. Fr. Miguel. Compendio Gramatical para la Inteligencia del Idioma Tarahumar. Mexico, 1826.

Thiel, Bernardo A. (1) Apuntes Lexicograficos de las Lenguas y Dialectos de los Indios de Costa Rica. San José de Costa Rica, 1882.

Thiel, Bernardo A. (2) Viajes á Varias Partes de la Republica de Costa Rica. San José, 1896.

Uhde, Adolph. Die Länder am untern Rio Bravo del Norte. Heidelberg, 1861.

Uhle, M. Verwandtschaften und Wanderungen der Tschibtscha. In Congrès International des Américanistes, 7th sess. Berlin, 1888.

Vater, Johann Severin. Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde. Vols. I–IV. Berlin, 1806–1817.

Velasco, José Francisco. (1) Noticias Estadisticas del Estado de Sonora. In Bol. Soc. Mex. Geogr. y Est., vol. VIII. Mexico, 1860.

——— (2) Continuacion de la Estadistica de Sonora. Ibid., vol X, 1863.

Venegas, Miguel. Noticia de la California y de su Conquista Temporal, y Espiritual Hasta el Tiempo Presente. Vols. I–III. Madrid, 1757.

Villagutierre Soto-Mayor, Juan de. Historia de la Conquista de la Provincia de el Itza. [Madrid] 1701.

Villa-Señor y Sanchez, Joseph Antonio de. Theatro Americano. Vols. I, II. Mexico, 1746–48.

Williams, J. J. The Isthmus of Tehuantepec. New York, 1852.

Young, Thomas. Narrative of a Residence on the Mosquito Shore. London, 1842.

Zapata, Juan Ortiz. Relacion de las Misiones que la Compañia de Jesus tiene en el Reino y Provincia de la Nueva Vizcaya. 1678. In Doc. Hist. Méx., 4th ser., vol. III. Mexico, 1857.

INDEX OF LINGUISTIC FAMILIES, TRIBES, AND SETTLEMENTS

Page

ACALA ... 61
ACAXEE ... 19–21, 24, 31
ACHIS ... 66
ACOCLAMES ... 34
AGUACATECA ... 66, 67
AGUASCALIENTES ... 43
AHOMAMAS ... 39
AHOME ... 5, 12–16, 24, 26, 35
AIAGE ... 20
AIBINO, AIVINO ... 4–6, 24, 26
AJUCHITLAN ... 50
ALAGUILAC ... 72, 73
ALAMAMAS ... 39
ALCHEDOMA ... 24–26, 29, 34
ALTAMIRA ... 49
AMATITLAN ... 69
AMISHGO, AMUCHO, AMUSGO ... 54
ANACANA ... 45
ANCASIGUAIS ... 45
ANCAVISTIS ... 24, 26
ANCHANES ... 24, 26, 30
ANTIGUA ... 68
APACHE ... 6, 8, 25, 27–30, 32, 37, 45
ARETINES ... 45
ARIGAMES ... 24, 32
ARIVETZI ... 7
ASUNCIÓN DE MACOYAHUI ... 18
ASUNCIÓN DE TEPAVE ... 18
ASUNCIÓN TLAXCALILLA ... 41
ATÉ. *See* ATEANACA.
ATEACARI ... 22, 24, 26
ATEANACA ... 22, 24, 26
ATITLAN ... 68
ATOYAC ... 50
AUYAPEMES ... 45
AYAPAGUEMES ... 45
AZTEC ... 17, 42, 46, 50–52, 72, 78, 82

BABO ... 24, 28, 32
BABISPE. *See* BAPISPE.
BACA ... 14, 26
BACABACHES ... 24, 26
BACAPAS ... 24, 26
BAGIOPA, BAQUIOPA ... 24, 26
BAIMENA, BAITRENA ... 17, 18
BAIMOA ... 20, 24, 26, 32
BAITRENA ... 18
See BAIMENA.
BAMOA ... 4, 5, 24
BAPIAPE ... 8
BAPISPE ... 4, 5, 24, 32–34
BAQUIOPA. *See* BAGIOPA.
BASOPA ... 16, 17, 24, 26
BASOPAN ... 27
BASIROAS ... 24, 26, 29, 31–33
BATUCARI ... 15, 16, 24, 26, 27

Page

BATUCOS ... 8, 24, 26, 32
See EUDEVE.
BATUROQUE ... 24, 27
BAYACATOS ... 24, 27
BAYAMOS ... 94
BAYANO. *See* CUNA.
BECEITA. *See* VECEITA.
BELEN ... 11
BIARAS, BIARIS ... 24, 27, 30
BORAGIOS ... 10
See VAROHIO.
BORRADOS ... 45
BORUCA ... 83, 84, 88–92
BOTO. *See* VOTO.
BRIBRI ... 88–92
BRUNCA. *See* BORUCA.
BUASDABA ... 8, 25, 33
BUASDAPAS ... 34
BUGAVA ... 93, 94
BULBULS ... 79
BURICAS, BURUCAS. *See* BORUCA.

CABECAR, CABECARA, CABECARES ... 83, 89, 91
CABEZA ... 37
CACALOTES ... 30
CACAOPERA ... 76
CACARI, CACARIA ... 24, 27
CADINIAS ... 45
CAHABON ... 68
CAHIGUAS. *See* KIOWA.
CAHITA ... 11–16, 21, 29
See YAQUI.
CAHUIMETO ... 16
CAJONE ... 55
CAJUENCHE ... 24, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34
CAKCHIKEL ... 67, 68, 75
CALDERAS ... 93
CANAYNES ... 45
CANCERES ... 24, 27
CANGEN ... 82
CANTREN ... 78
CARAMARIGUANES ... 45
CARAMIGUAIS ... 45
CARAPOA ... 14
CARCA ... 80
CARCHA ... 79
See CUKRA.
CARLANES ... 24, 27
CARIB ... 75, 76, 81, 96
CARIBAYES ... 45
CARIBBEAN ... 81, 95
CATANAMEPAQUES ... 45
CAVENATA ... 12
CAVISERAS ... 39
CAXCANES ... 24
CAZCAN ... 23, 24, 40–43

Page

Cazcanes Chichimecas ... 24
Cerro Prieto ... 47
Chafalotes ... 24,27
Chajul ... 67
Chakahuaxti ... 49
Chaliva ... 93,94
Chañabal, Chañeabal ... 64,65
Changuaguanes ... 24,27
Changuene ... 83,84,89,93
Changuina ... 90,94
Charay ... 15
Chargas ... 41
Chatino ... 54
Chemeguabas. *See* Chemeguet.
Chemegue ... 24
Chemeguet, Chemeguaba, Chemegues, Chemehuevi ... 24,26,27
Chiapa ... 61
Chiapanec, Chiapaneca ... 60–62,82
Chiapanecan ... 76–78,85
Chibcha ... 80,81,84,85,88,89,95
Chicagua. *See* Sigua.
Chicaua ... 82,93
Chichagua. *See* Sigua.
Chichen Itza ... 71
Chichimec, Chichimeca, Chichimecos ... 40–43, 46,48,83,93
Chichimecas Blancos ... 43
Chicorata, Chicorato ... 12,16,24,26,32
Chicomucelo ... 64,65
Chicomucelteca ... 64,65
Chicuras ... 24,27
See Cicuris.
Chicurata ... 17
Chilanga ... 74
Chimalapan ... 72
Chinantec ... 55
Chinarra ... 24,29,32,34
See Huma.
Chinipa ... 8–10,18,24,26,28,32,33,35
See Tarahumare.
Chinquime ... 53
Chiquimula ... 70
Chiricaguis, Chiricahua ... 24,27
Chiros ... 24,28
Chirripo ... 89–91
Chizo ... 24,28,34
Chocho ... 51,53,54,96
Chochontin ... 53
Chol, Choles ... 61–64,66,69,71–73,75
Cholomos ... 30
Cholos ... 94
Choluteca ... 76,77
See Mangue.
Chomes ... 83
Chondal, Chontal ... 52,53,58–63,74,76
Chontal-Lencas ... 74
Chora ... 21
See Cora.
Chorote ... 78
Chorotega ... 77,78,82–84,86
Chorti ... 63,69,70,72
Chota ... 21
See Cora.
Chuchon. *See* Chocho.
Chucunaque. *See* Cuna.

Page

Chuje, Chuhe ... 64–66
Chuloteca ... 77
Chumaltenango ... 68
Chumula ... 94
Cibola ... 31
Cicuris ... 27
Cinaloas ... 11–16,21
See Yaqui.
Cinarras ... 34
Civolo ... 31
Coahuiltecan, Coahuilteco ... 38,42
Coban ... 68,69
Coca ... 23,24,26
Cochimi ... 2,3
Coclamas ... 24,27,28
Cocobiptas ... 24,27
Cocopa, Cucapa, Cuhanes ... 2,25,27,29,32,34
Cocos ... 79
Cocotlanes. *See* Colotlan.
Coctos. *See* Cotos.
Cocoyome ... 28,37
Coguinachis ... 7,24,26
See Opata.
Colotlan, Cocotlan, Coloclan ... 22,23
Comanche ... 29
Comecamotes ... 45
Comecrudo ... 38,45
Comesacapemes ... 45
Comicari ... 33
Comopori ... 15,16,24,26
Comoripa, Comuripa ... 4–6,15,24,26
Concepción ... 9
Concepción de Chicorato ... 17
Concepción de Vaca ... 14
Concha, Concho ... 8,24,26,27,29,30–32,34,36–38,42
Conejos ... 24,27,30
Conguaco ... 74
Conicari ... 12,18,19,33
Contlas ... 24,27
Cookra ... 79
Copala ... 53
Copan ... 63,69,70
Cora ... 3,21–24,26,32,34,36,40–43
Corbesies. *See* Corobicies.
Corobicies ... 77,82
Corotapa ... 82,93
Cotoname ... 38,45
Cotos ... 83,84,88,92
Cotzal ... 67
Cuachichiles. *See* Guachichile.
Cuampes ... 24,27
Cuanes ... 2
See Cocopa.
Cucapa. *See* Cocopa.
Cuencamé ... 39
Cues ... 19,24,25,27,31
Cueva. *See* Cuna.
Cuhanes. *See* Cocopa.
Cuilapa ... 52
Cuicateco ... 55
Cuitlateca, Cuitlateco ... 50,51,53
Cuixtlahuac ... 52
Cukra ... 79,80
See Carcha, Cookra.
Culmi ... 75
Cumupa ... 8,25,33,34

Page

Cuna 94-96
Cunacuna. *See* Cuna.
Cuñai 24, 27
See Cocopa.
Cutecos 24, 28, 29
See Husorones.
Cutganes 24, 27
See Cocopa.

Daparabopos 39
Dariens 94
See Cuna.
Didu 2
Diegueño 28
Diria, Dirian 76-78, 82
Ditsakana 29
Djbar-uak 92
Dohema, Dohme 7
See Eudeve.
Doraces 83, 93
Dorachos 94
See Dorask.
Dorask, Doraskan, Doraskean, Dorasque 77, 80, 90, 93-95
Dorasque-Changuina 93
Dulce Nombre. *See* Culmi.

Eastern Lacandones 70
Echunticas 24, 28
Edu 2
Egue 6
See Eudeve.
El Fuerte 35
Esquipulas 70
Estrella 89, 91
Etla 55
Eudeve, Heve 6, 7, 26, 34

Faraon, Faraon Apache 24, 26-31

Gabilanes 37
Garabito 83
Gecualme 22
Gecuiches 24, 28
Genicuiches 24, 28
See Serranos.
Gila Apache, Gileños 24, 25, 28, 32
Gojoles 24, 28
Gozaua, Gozopas, Guaçaues. *See* Guazave.
Guachichile 22, 23, 40, 41, 44, 47
Guachichiles Chichimecos 41
Guadalupe 10
Guaicamaópas 24, 28
Guailopas 24, 28, 29
Guajiquero 74
Gualaca 93, 94
Guaropaque 28
Guasarochic 29
Guatajigua 74
Guatusan 85
Guatuso 77, 80, 82, 84, 87
Guavi 59
See Huame.
Guayma 5, 10, 11
Guaymi, Guaymie 83, 84, 89, 93-96
Guazápare, Guazaparis, Guazipare, Guizipares 8-10, 32, 33, 35, 36

Page

Guazarachis 24, 28
Guazave, Quasare 5, 12, 15-17, 28
Guetare, Guetars 83-90
Guichola. *See* Huichol.
Guichicovi 60
Guixolotes 45
Gummesacapemes 45
Gurutina. *See* Orotina.

Havasupai, Supis 25, 31
Heve. *See* Eudeve.
Hiāhiū. *See* Otomi.
Hiaqui. *See* Yaqui.
Hichucios 24
Hijos, Hios, Ihios 9, 10, 24, 26, 29, 31-33, 35
Himeris 24, 34, 35
Hina 20, 21, 24, 26
Hizos 24, 29
Hoabonoma 30
See Oaboponomas.
Hoeras 39
Horcasitas 44
Hostimuri 15
Huabi, Huave 59, 60
See Huame.
Huame 59
Huasteca 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 65, 66
Huastecoa 47
Huave. *See* Huabi.
Hudcoadanes 24, 29
Huere 35
Huehuetenango 67
Huetare. *See* Guetare.
Huichol, Huicholas 22, 28, 41
Huime. *See* Hume.
Huite 10, 21, 24, 26
Huma 24, 29, 34
See Chinarra.
Hume, Huime 20, 21, 24, 26
Humeris 32
Hure 35
Husorones 24, 28, 29
Huvagueres 24, 29, 31, 32
Hymeris. *See* Himeris.

Ihios. *See* Hijos.
Ika 2
Intibucat 74
Ipapana 49
Iritilas, Iritiles, Irritila, Irritilas 37-40, 42
Itza 70-72
Ixhuatan 59
Ixil 67, 68
Iximchi 68
Izcateco 55
Iztepec 55

Jacalteca 64-66
Jacaltenango 64-66, 69
Jagullapais. *See* Walapai.
Jalapa 69
Jalchedun, Jalchedune. *See* Alchedoma.
Jallicuamai, Jallicuamay 25, 29, 34
See Quigyuma.
Jamajabs. *See* Mohave.
Janambre 44, 46

Page

Janos 25, 29
Jaquallapais. *See* Walapai.
Jicarilla, Jicarilla Apache 27, 32
See Xicarillas.
Jicaque 74–76, 96
Jicaquean 75
Jijimes 19–21
Jinca. *See* Xinca.
Jobal. *See* Jova.
Jocomes, Jocomis 25, 29
Jocotan 69
Jonases, Jonaz. *See* Meco.
Jova, Ova 7, 8
Juave. *See* Huame.
Julimes 30, 34
Jumanes 25, 29
Jupiltepeque 73
Jutiapa 73

K'aktchi. *See* Kekchi.
Kawia 28
Kekchi 67–69, 71
Kiche, Quiche 67, 68
Kiowa, Cahigua 24, 27
Kork-uak 92
Kotsoteka 28

Lacandon 63, 70–72
Laguneros 37–40
See Iritilas.
Laman 79
Lanquin 68
Las Prietas 38, 45
Laymon 2
Lenca 73–75, 79
Lencan Stock 53, 72–75, 77, 96
Lencan Pupuluca 73, 74
Lipan 45
Lislique 76
Llamparicas 25, 29
Loretto 2
Lorillard City. *See* Menche.
Los Dolores 7
Lower Pima 4–8, 11, 18, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36
Lower Tarahumare 9

Macoyahui, Macoyahuy 18, 31
Maguiaquis 25, 28, 29
Maiconeras 39
Maiz 47
Malinchenos 45
Mam, Mame 65–67
Mamites, Mammites 25, 29
Mandinga. *See* Cuna.
Mangue 76–78, 82–84
See Chorotega.
Maribi. *See* Subtiaba.
Maricopa 30
Mariguanes 45
Matachic 8
Matagalpa 76
Matagalpan 76, 77, 96
Matapanes 25, 30
Matlaltzinco 48
See Pirinda.
Maya 15, 59, 63, 64, 67, 70–72, 75
Mayan Family 1, 48, 49, 53, 59, 61, 62, 65–67, 69
Mayan Pupuluca 73

Page

Mayathan. *See* Maya.
Mayo 5, 12–14, 18, 19, 26, 35
Mayon 12
Mazahua 46, 47
Mazatec, Mazateca, Mazateco 54, 55
Mazatenango 67
Meco 48
Mediotaguel 25, 32, 34
Mejuos 25, 30
Melchoras 79, 80
Menche 63, 71
Mescaleros. *See* Mezcaleros.
Mesquites. *See* Mezquites.
Meviras 39
Mexican, Mexicano 19, 20, 23, 34, 36, 39, 40, 42, 43, 48, 50, 51, 60, 61, 78, 82, 83, 93
See Aztec, Nahuatl, Nahuatlan, Sigua.
Mexcaltepec 50
Mextitlaneca 50
Mextitlateco 42
Mezcaleros 25, 30
Mezquites 30
Michoacano 51
See Tarasco.
Micos 79
Mictlantongo 52
Mimbreños 25, 30
Miopacoas 39
Mita 69
Mixe 51, 60, 65, 74
Mixtec, Mixtecas 52–58
Mixteco-Zapoteco 54
Mize. *See* Mixe.
Mobas. *See* Movas.
Mochicagui, Mochicahuy 15, 35
Mocorito 35
Mohave, Jamajabs, Tamajabs, Yamajabs 25, 29, 34
Montañes 52
Montecristo 70
Montenegro 65
Mopan, Mopanas 64, 70–72
Moreno 76
Mosquito 79, 80, 94, 96
Motozintleca 65
Movas, Mobas 4–6, 25, 26
Move-Valiente 95
Moyaua 82, 93
Muares 25, 30
Muoi 95
Murire 95
Murire-Bukueta 95
Muutzicat 22, 25, 26
See Muutzizti.
Muutzizti 25

Nacameri 25, 35
Nacosuras 25, 35
Nagrandans 77
See Subtiaba.
Nahuatl, Nahua, Nahoa 12, 42, 43, 55, 82–84
Nahuatlan 1, 18, 20, 21, 24, 36, 37, 41, 44, 46, 50, 51, 59, 65, 72–74, 76, 78, 89, 92, 93
Naolingo 49
Nayarit, Nayarita 21, 22, 24
See Cora.

Page

Navaho, Navajo, Navajoa 25,30
Nebaj 67
Nebomes. *See* Lower Pima.
Nenton 66
Netzecho 55
Neuton. *See* Nenton.
Nevomes. *See* Lower Pima.
Nicoya 78
See Orotina.
Nio 16,17
Niquiran 42,76,78
Nochiztlan 52
Nocori 4
Norteño 95
Nuestra Señora de Aranzazu 27
Nuevo León 38
Nure, Nuri 4–6,25,26,28,32

Oaboponomas 25,30
Ochoes 39
Ocoroni 12,25,32,35
Ocoroiri. *See* Ocoroni.
Ocotlan 55
Oguera, Ohuera 16
Olive 44
Olmec 55
Onabas, Onavas 4–6,25,26
Opas 25,30
Opata 4–8,11,25–27,32–35
Opata-Tarahumar-Pima family 22
Opatoro 74
Oposines 25,30
Orejones 25,30
Oronihuatos 25,30
Orotina 78,81,82,86,96
Orotinan 76–78
Ostimuri. *See* Hostimuri.
Otaquitamones 25,30
Otomi 41–43,46,47,50
Otomian 48
Ova. *See* Jova.

Pacaca 83
Pacasa 25,32,35
Pachera 8,9
Pachuca 42
Paiute 30
Pajalames 25,30
Pakawa, Pakawan 37,38,45
Palenque 62,63,70
Pame 42,44,46,47
Panana (Pawnee) 25,30
Panguayes 45
Pantasmas 79
Pantepec 49
Paogas 39
Papago 26,30
Papudo 20,25,26
Paro 82
Parras 39
Parrastahis 79
Pasalmes 25,30
Pasitas 45
Pawnee 30
Paxuchis 25,30
Paya, Payan 74,75,96
Payuchas 25,30

Page

Pazuchis 30
Pericu 2,3
Petapa 69
Petatlan 35
Peten 63,70,71
See Itza.
Piatos 25,30
Piedras Negras 63
Pima 4–6,11,15,16,30,31,35
See Lower Pima.
Piman 2,4,6,26,36
Pima Bajo. *See* Lower Pima.
Pimeria alta 11
Pinome 53
Pinos 41
Pintos 45
Pipil 68,72,73,75,78
Pirinda 46,48
Piros 25,32,35
Pisone 44,46
Poarames 25,30
Pococi 82
Pokam, Pokomam 64,66,68,69,73
Pokonchi 68,69
Polames 25,30
Poliutla 50
Ponida 7
Popoloca, Popoloco 51,53,54,60,73
See Pupuluca.
Potlapigua 4,32
Potrero 93
Pueblos 31
Pulicas, Puilques, Puliquis 25,30
Pupuluca 5,53,68,73,74
See Popoloca.
Pupuluca Cakchikel 68
Purísima Concepción de Arnedo 47
Putima 25,30

Qualcan 83
Quasare 35
See Guazave.
Quekchi. *See* Kekchi.
Quelene 61,62
Quemaya 25,30,31
Quepos 83,84,88,90
Quequexque 82,93
Quetzaltenango 67
Quicamopas 25,31
Quiche. *See* Kiche.
Quigyuma 29
See Jallicuamai.
Quihuimas 25
See Quiquima.
Quinicuanes 35
Quiquima 25,31,34
Quirigua 63,70

Rabinal 67
Rama 80,87,96

Sabaibo 19,20
Sabanero 95
Sahuaripa 7
Salineros 11,25,26
Saltillo 41
Salto de Agua 64

Page

San Agustin 72
San Andrés 20
San Andrés Chicahuaxtla 53
San Andrés Chinipas 28
San Andrés de Conicari 10,28
San Antonio 44
San Blas Indians. *See* Cuna.
San Cristobal 50
San Cristobal Acasaguastlan 72
San Francisco 50
San Francisco Borgia 2
San Francisco de Coahuila 38
San Francisco Xavier 44
San Ignacio 9
San Ignacio de Chicuris 17
San Ignacio de Nio 17
S. José Cabecar 89
San José Charay 14
San José Chicahuaxtla 53
San José del Toro 18
San José Temaichic 9
San José Teopari 7
San José Vizarron 48
S. Juan Bautista de Carapoa 13
San Luis 41
San Luis de la Paz 47,48
San Martin de Atotonilco 20
San Martin Ytunyosa 53
San Mateo Malzura 7
San Mateo Tecayas 31
San Miguel 9
San Miguel Chicahuaxtla 53
San Miguel de Zuaque 15
San Miguel Mezquitic 41
San Miguel Uspantan 68
San Pedro Carcha 68
San Pedro Guadalcazar 43
San Pedro Guazave 17
San Pedro Sabana 64
Santa Ana 34
Santa Catalina de Baitrena 18
Santa Catarina Martyrs de Rio Verde 43
Santa Cruz Quiche 67
Santafé de Punta-hicacos 76
Santa Inés 10
Santa Inés de Chinipa 10,28
Santa Lucia Cozumalhuapa 73
Santa María de Batuco 33
Santa María Magdalena de Temoris 35–36
Santa Rosa 70
Santa Teresa de Guazapares 36
Santo Domingo Chicahuaxtla 53
Santo Domingo del Palenque 64
Santo Tomas 7,8
Saulapaguemes 45
Savanerics 94
Savirijoa 14
Segua. *See* Sigua.
Següis. *See* Tegüis.
Seri 4–7,10,11,36
Serranos 28,48
Shelaba. *See* Sigua.
Sibubapas 25,31
Sigua 92
Similiton 74
Sinacantan 73

Page

Sinaloas 11–15,21,27,28,30,31
See Yaqui.
Sinaloita 14
Siquias 79
Sisibotari 5,25,32,35
Sisimbres 25,28,31
Sivirijoa 15
Sivolos 25,30,31
Smoos 79
See Ulva.
Sobaipuri 25,31
Sobas 31
Soledad de las Canoas 48
Solola 68
Sonoran group 21
Sovas 25
Suaque, Suaqui. *See* Zuague.
Subinha 65
Subironas 79
Subtiaba, Subtiaban 76,77,96
Suchiapa 61
Suerre (?) 87
Sumas 25,32,35
Sumo 79
See Ulva.
Sunas 33
Supis. *See* Havasupai.

Tactic 69
Tagualilos 45
Tahue 25,32,34,35
See Tahueca.
Tahueca 35
Talamanca 85,88,89,96
Talamancan 80,85,86,90–93
Tamaja 69
Tamajabs. *See* Mohave.
Tamaulipas 38,45
Tamaulipecan 42
Tamaulipeco 44,45
Tamazulapa 52
Tamime 43
Tanaquiapemes 45
Tanoan 35
Taocas, Twacas 79
Tapachula 60,65
Tapachulteca 60,65
Tapacolmes 25,30,31,34
Tapijulapanes 60
Tarahumaré 4,6–10,18,19,28,29,33–38
Tarascan 47
Tarasco 46,48,51
Tariaca 83,89–91
Tatimolo 49
Taura 10
Teacuacitzica, Teacuacitzisti, Tecuatzilzisti 22,25,26
Tebaca 19,20
Teca 51
Tecargonis 25,31
Tecaya 20,25,26,30–32
Tecayagues, Tecayagui 19,24,25,27,31
See Cues.
Teco 50,51,53
See Cuitlateca.
Tecolutan 72

Page

Tecoripa ... 4–6, 25, 26
Tecpam ... 68
Tecualme ... 22
Tecuatzilzisti. *See* Teacuacitzica.
Tecuexe, Tecuezes ... 23, 24, 43
Tedexenos ... 45
Teguecos. *See* Tehueco.
Teguima ... 6, 7, 25, 26
See Opata.
Tegüis, Següis ... 7, 25, 26
See Opata.
Tehatas ... 25, 29, 31, 33
Tehue ... 33, 34
Tehueco, Tegueco, Thehueco ... 5, 12–15, 18, 19, 27, 29, 30, 35
Tehuiso, Tehuizos ... 25, 29, 31, 33
Teluskie(?) ... 94
Temori ... 9, 10, 25, 32
Tenango ... 53
Tenime ... 53
Temosique ... 64
Teo-Chichimeca ... 43
Tepahue, Tepaüe, Tepave ... 18, 19, 31, 33
Teparantana ... 25, 31
Tepaüe, Tepave. *See* Tepahue.
Tepecano ... 22–24, 28, 43
Tepehuane, Tepehuan, Tepehua, Tepehuana, Tepeguane ... 4, 5, 8, 9, 17, 19, 23, 24, 27, 36, 40, 41, 46, 50
Teposcolula ... 52
Tepuzculano ... 52
Tequistlateca ... 58, 59
See Chontal.
Tequistlatecan ... 59
Terraba, Terbis, Terrebes, Tiribi, Tirribi ... 83, 84, 89–92
Tesomachic ... 8
See Tosonachic.
Tetikilhati ... 49
Teul, Teule ... 23, 24, 42
Teul-Chichimecs ... 24, 40, 41, 43
Tezcoco, Tezcuco ... 42, 50
Thehuecos. *See* Tehueco.
Tiburones ... 25, 32, 36
Tila ... 64
Tintis ... 25, 31
Tiribi, Tiribies, Tiribis, Tirribi, Tirribies. *See* Terraba.
Tlacolulita ... 59
Tlajiaco. *See* Tlaxiaco.
Tlaltenango ... 24
Tlapanec, Tlapaneco ... 51, 53, 54
Tlascala, Tlaxcala ... 50
Tlascalan ... 50, 51, 74
Tlascalteca ... 74
Tlaxcala. *See* Tlascala.
Tlaxco ... 50
Tlaxiaco ... 52
Tlaxomultecas ... 25
Toboso ... 27, 28, 31, 32, 34, 37, 38, 42
Tocho ... 25, 28, 31
Tojolabal ... 64
See Chañabal.
Toltec, Tolteca ... 42, 43
Tollan ... 48
Tonachic ... 4

Page

Tonases ... 48
Tontos ... 25, 32
Toongla ... 79
Topia ... 20, 21, 31
See Acaxee.
Torames ... 25, 32, 36
Torasque ... 89
Toro ... 14
Tosonachic ... 8
Totonac ... 46, 49, 50
Totonicapan ... 67
Tovare. *See* Tubar.
Toxare ... 89
Trike ... 52–54
Tripas blancas ... 37
Troe ... 18
See Zoe.
Tubar, Tubare ... 8, 9, 17, 18
Tubor-uak ... 92
Tucurric, Tucurrique ... 89, 91
Tucuru ... 69
Tula ... 44, 48
Tule ... 42, 94
See Cuna.
Tumbala ... 64
Twakas. *See* Taocas.
Tzental ... 60–63, 69, 71
Tzotzil ... 62
Tzutuhil ... 68

Ulva, Ulua ... 78, 79
Ulvan family ... 78, 96
Upanguayma ... 11
Upper Pima. *See* Pima.
Urutina. *See* Orotina.
Uscapemes ... 45
Uspanteca ... 68
Usumatlan ... 72
Utciti, Utschiti ... 2, 3
Ute, Yuta ... 25, 32

Vaca ... 14
See Baca.
Vacoregue ... 12, 15, 16 35
Vaimoa ... 20 24–26, 32
See Baimoa.
Valientes ... 95, 96
Valle de Atotonilco ... 41
Valle de S. Bartholomé ... 37
Valle de Santa Bárbara ... 36
Varohio, Boragio ... 8–10, 28, 29, 31–33
Vassapalles ... 39
Vayema ... 25, 32
Veceita, Beceita, Viceita, Viceite ... 83, 84, 89, 92
Venado ... 41
Voto ... 82, 86, 87

Wabi ... 59
See Huame.
Waïcuri ... 2, 3, 34
Waicurian ... 2
Walapai, Jagullapais, Jaquallapais ... 25, 29
Walwa, Woolwas. *See* Ulva.

Xalapa-la-Grande ... 59
Xalpan ... 49
Xaltepec ... 52

Page

Xanambre 44
See Janambre.
Xelitla 42
Xicagua. *See* Sigua.
Xicalango 61
Xicaque 75
See Jicaque.
Xicarillas 25,32,37
See Jicarilla.
Xileños. *See* Gileños.
Xinca, Xincan 72–73,96
Xixime 19
See Jijime.
Xuchipila 24

Yacum 28
Yamajabs. *See* Mohave.
Yamparicas. *See* Llamparicas.
Yanabopos 39
Yaqui, Hiaqui ... 4,5,9,11,12–19,21,29.32,33,35,36
Yaquimi 12
Yauhuatlan 52
Yavipai 25,32
See Apache.
Yecoratos 25,32
Yepachic 4,8
Yope 51,53
Yuanes 2,25,32
See Cocopa.

Page

Yule. *See* Cuna.
Yuma 28,29,30,32,34
Yuman 2,3,26,59
Yuta. *See* Ute.

Zaachilla 55
Zacateco 20,23,24,39,40–43
Zaklohpakap 66
See Mam.
Zalaya 43
Zapanci 82
Zapotec, Zapotecas 52–60
Zapotecan 1,52,54,55
Zayahuecos 25,32,36
Zegua 89
Zeldales, Zeltales 62
See Tzental.
Zentispac 36
Zimatlan 61
Zocaltenango 65
Zoe 16–18
Zoquean Family 1,60
Zotzil, Zotziles 60–62
See Tzotzil.
Zuague, Zuaque 4,12–16,31,36
Zuñi 31
Zutuhil. *See* Tzutuhil.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION LIBRARIES
3 9088 01421 7913